

CA1
EP605
-85R13



Canadian Environmental
Advisory Council

Conseil consultatif
canadien de l'environnement

1 9 8 3

**Canadian
Environmental
Advisory
Council**

***Report of the Eighth
Assembly of Environment
Councils of Canada***



The Public Role in
Setting and Enforcing
Environmental Standards

Role of Environmental
Councils

Canada



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115537342>

CAI
EP605
-85R13

**Canadian
Environmental
Advisory
Council**

Report No. 13

Enquiries concerning the work of the Council and requests for Council publications should be addressed to:

The Executive Secretary
Canadian Environmental Advisory Council
c/o Environment Canada
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0H3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Introduction	1
Welcome Address	2
Reports by Councils and by Provincial and Territorial Representatives	3
- Introduction	3
- Québec Advisory Council on the Environment	3
- Environmental Council of New Brunswick	3
- Nova Scotia Environmental Control Council	4
- Manitoba Environmental Council	4
- Environment Council of Alberta	6
- Canadian Environmental Advisory Council	6
- Saskatchewan — Department of Environment	8
- Ontario — Ministry of Environment	8
- Northwest Territories — Department of Renewable Resources	8
The Public Role in Setting and Enforcing Environmental Standards	9
- Introduction	9
- Review of the Report "Environmental Standards: A Comparative Study of Canadian Standards, Standard Setting Processes and Enforcement" by A.R. Lucas	9
- Discussion	11
- Recommendations	12
Role of Environmental Councils	15
- Introduction	15
- "A Cabinet Minister's View of Environmental Advisory Councils", an address by the Hon. John Roberts, Federal Minister of the Environment	15
- "Public Point of View on the Role of Environmental Advisory Councils", an address by Dr. David Brooks, Marbek Resource Consultants, Ltd.	16
- "Manitoba View on the Role of Environmental Councils", an address by Dr. A.C. Maniar, Chairman, Manitoba Environmental Council	18
- "Living in Harmony with our Planet", an address by Jacques Gérin, Deputy Minister, Environment Canada	20
- Reports of Working Groups	22
- Discussion	23
- Summary	23
Other Business	25
- Science Council of Canada Report: "Canada's Threatened Forests"	25
- Publication of the Proceedings	26
- Plans for the 1984 Assembly	26
Annexes	
A. Program and Background Information	28
B. Attendance and Mailing List for Invitations	33
C. Summary of Recommendations	37
D. Membership of Working Groups	39
E. Guide for Working Groups	40
F. Report by Working Group 1	43
G. Report by Working Group 2	45
H. Report by Working Group 3	46
I. Summary of Information on Councils	48

INTRODUCTION

The Eighth Assembly of Environmental Councils of Canada was held in Hull, Québec and Ottawa, Ontario on June 5-6-7, 1983. The Assembly was hosted by the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council.

All operational environment councils were represented at the Assembly. Provinces and territories which did not have formally constituted councils were invited to send an observer. The Yukon, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland were not represented in either a delegate or observer capacity.

The location of events alternated between Ottawa and Hull, opening with registration and a reception in the Skyline Hotel; shifting to Place Vincent Massey in Hull for the business sessions; and returning to Ottawa for a luncheon in the South Block, Parliament Buildings, and to the Victoria Room, Skyline Hotel for a dinner meeting.

Two main subjects were addressed during the Assembly: "The Role of Environmental Councils", and "The Public Role in Setting and Enforcing Environmental Standards". This report is a summary of the presentations and discussions related to those subjects and to other matters raised during the Assembly. Only items of particular importance, such as recommendations, have been reproduced in this report in verbatim form.

The format of this report does not follow exactly the sequence of events as described in the Program (Annex A). All material and discussion related to specific subjects has been grouped for ease of reading and reference. However, because of the importance of the recommendations, they appear in summary form as Annex C.

WELCOME ADDRESS

Delegates were welcomed to the Assembly by Mr. Tom Beck, Chairman, and by Dr. Robert Bergeron, Vice-Chairman of the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council (CEAC).

It was noted that CEAC did not wish to play a role as a continuing focal point for the annual assemblies, but had offered in 1982 to host the VIIIth joint meeting to avoid any possibility of the series of annual gatherings being interrupted. Mr. Beck expressed the hope that a decision would be made on plans for future meetings at least one year ahead.

Mr. Beck also offered a special welcome to observers from the provinces and territories which do not currently have environmental councils. He invited the observers to take a full and active part in the program.

It was noted that the timing of this Assembly was very appropriate, as it was being held during Environment Week, June 5 to 11.

Mr. Beck and Dr. Bergeron gave a brief review of the program, drawing attention to the main themes, in particular the workshop on "Role of Environmental Councils".

REPORTS BY COUNCILS AND BY PROVINCIAL AND TERRITORIAL REPRESENTATIVES

Introduction

Dr. P.F.M. McLoughlin, Vice-Chairman, CEAC, chaired this session. The session was devoted to reports on activities of the past year by councils, and observations by representatives of other provinces and territories.

Advisory Council on the Environment (Québec)

M. André Beauchamp, Chairman, presented this report on the activities of Council. The report also alluded to the other advisory bodies attached to the Ministry of the Environment. For the James Bay region, they are: the James Bay Advisory Committee on the Environment, with Cree, provincial and federal representation; the tripartite Impact Evaluating Committee; and the bipartite Impact Review Committee. For the region north of the 55th parallel, they are: the tripartite KATIVIK Advisory Committee; and the bipartite KATIVIK Environmental Quality Commission. These committees perform both advisory and administrative functions, and are specially designed to take into account the social and political characteristics of these areas.

The three agencies in southern Québec are:

1. The Advisory Board on Ecological Reserves, which uses the extensive scientific knowledge of its 15 members;
2. Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement (BAPE), (Office of Public Hearings on the Environment), which consists of five full-time members and ad hoc members commissioned by the Cabinet, and has 18 permanent positions in the public service. It holds public hearings on projects subject to regulations concerning impact assessment and review. It reports to the Minister, who then sends his recommendations to the Council of Ministers for a final decision. It has excellent credibility because of the thoroughness of its investigations and the reliability of its reports.
3. The Advisory Council on the Environment advises the Minister on orientation and policies, at the Minister's request or on its own initiative (at the request of its members, private individuals, or groups). It consists of ten members chosen from the public and a full-time chairman appointed for five years. The Council has seven permanent positions in the public service.

The Advisory Council is particularly attentive to changes to proposed acts and regulations that affect the environment. It is also concerned with exploring comprehensive issues. The Council may hold public consultations, but it does not have a mandate for investigation. It tries to increase government awareness of general policies, rather than dealing with short-term results.

In 1982, the Council advised the Minister on six issues:

- Preliminary proposal for a policy on the wetlands (April 30, 1982);
- Opinion on Bill 55 to amend the Environmental Quality Act (June 9, 1982);
- Policy on forest surrounding lakes and waterways in Québec (December 13, 1982);
- Opinion on the proposed regulations concerning water intended for human consumption;
- Opinion on the proposed prevention policy;
- Opinion on municipal wastewater purification plants, their outlets into waterways and the case of the Montréal Urban Community (1983).

At present, the Council is studying the following subjects:

- Policy on industrial wastes;
- Policy on the protection of shores in an environment affected by tides (final opinion);
- Policy on the means of intervention.

The Council wants to emphasize its tenth anniversary in early 1984. Members wish to increase public knowledge about the Council and to form a closer relationship with environmental groups.

Environmental Council of New Brunswick

This report was presented by Dr. H. Henderson.

Mandate

The Council has responsibilities to two ministers, the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Natural Resources.

Under the Clean Environment Act, its duties are to study and report on relevant issues, either at the request of the Minister or with the Minister's approval; to receive submissions; and to submit annual reports to the Minister.

Under the Ecological Reserves Act, its duties to the Minister of Natural Resources are similar, with additional directives to conduct public hearings regarding the establishment, abolition or change of ecological reserve boundary lines; to report findings of hearings to the Minister; and to include recommendations on areas as ecological reserves in annual reports.

Activities

Council has held only two meetings since the last Assembly in Nova Scotia.

In September, Council received the reports of members who attended that Assembly.

Subjects considered of particular interest for future investigation were Global 2000; Environmental Education; and Reclamation of Areas Subjected to Surface Mining and other Extractive Processes (e.g. gravel pits and peat bogs). As a result of a recommendation of Council, landfill regulations, as opposed to guidelines, are being developed by the Department of Environment.

Council considered the Garrison problem discussed in Nova Scotia, and wrote to the Minister advising opposition by New Brunswick to a unilateral decision by the U.S. to transboundary diversion of water, because it might set a precedent which could affect New Brunswick.

In November, Council held a public meeting on the Island of Miscou, to discuss a proposal to establish two ecological reserves on the island. Due to an ambiguity in the notice of meeting, the local people concluded that their hunting and fishing rights were to be removed, and united to firmly oppose the proposal.

The November meeting marked the end of three years of service for current members. Due to the election in 1982, and a change of ministers, the new members had not yet been appointed. Council missed the guidance of Mrs. Margaret (Peg) Taylor, to whose creative and co-operative approach is largely attributed the good working relationship of Council with departments and ministers.

During the past three years, Council had a fairly good record of successes. Each year Council studied one or two issues referred by the Minister or chosen by Council. Its recommendations played a significant part in formulation of government policy.

Council restricted itself to policy matters because it had neither the expertise nor funds to conduct technical studies. Perhaps the Council should be more active in soliciting views and submissions from the public.

Nova Scotia Environmental Control Council

This report was presented by Mr. Morris Haugg, Executive Secretary of the Nova Scotia Environmental Control Council (NSECC).

There were some difficulties in the Department of Environment in Nova Scotia, which affected NSECC. There was no longer a permanent consultant on Council. Dr. Peter Ogden was no longer a member, due to budgetary restraints.

Activities

No quasi-judicial hearings were held in the past year. One public hearing was held in March/April, 1983. A panel discussion was held on the topic of environmental education and the public's role in environmental decision-making. Case studies were done, with emphasis on the Nova Scotia experience, and recommendations developed. Some of these were sent to the Minister, but no response had been received. No special studies, reports and publications were produced. A brochure was being prepared to promote better public understanding of the NSECC.

NSECC will have some input into a brief being prepared by the Department of Environment for submission to the Royal Commission on the Forestry Industry.

The Nova Scotia Environmental Awards program, which has existed for several years, is now part of NSECC's operations. Presentation of awards to the six winners, and several certificates of merit, were scheduled to be held on June 28.

Manitoba Environmental Council

The Chairman, Dr. A.C. Maniar, presented the Manitoba Environmental Council's (MEC) report.

The MEC, which acts as an advisory body to the Minister of Environment, had eight regional committees which were active during the past year. The MEC was assisted by technical committees concerned with education, energy, land use, environmental chemicals, water and waste, wildlife and publications.

Activities

The following briefs were approved by various committees and presented to the Minister of Environment:

1. *Land Use Brief*

The MEC recommended to the Minister that:

- 1) Land use policies should be broadened to provide guidelines for the agricultural industry.

- 2) Some control over agricultural development should be established for areas where significant resource values are present.
- 3) Guidelines for any kind of development should be established for those areas in which development may cause hazardous conditions.
- 4) Similar policies must be developed to include water resources.
- 5) Comprehensive inventories of lands containing significant natural and historic resources should be prepared and provided to all municipalities.
- 6) A long-term voluntary acquisition program of significant resource areas should be developed and implemented to ensure that these resources are not degraded or lost.
- 7) All Board and Commission members should receive a copy of the Provincial Land Use Policies at the time of their appointment, as well as any resource inventory information for any areas to be investigated.

2. *Wildlife Committee Briefs*

- 1) The MEC recommended to its Minister that he request the following of the Minister of Natural Resources:
 - a) to permit sport hunting of timber wolves only during the period for which a hunter's big game licence is valid and only in the area covered by the licence;
 - b) to limit the kill to one timber wolf per licence-holding sport hunter.
- 2) The MEC recommended to its Minister that he request the following of the Minister of Agriculture:
 - a) to review the Noxious Weeds Act with the objective of making it effective, enforceable and environmentally acceptable;
 - b) to consider amending the Schedule of Noxious Weeds;
 - c) to seek input in this review from personnel of the Department of Natural Resources as well as from scientists and botanists outside of his department;
 - d) to restrict the declaration of noxious weeds to those species which constitute a demonstrated threat to agricultural production and to delineate the area of the province in which each species is to be declared noxious.
- 3) The MEC recommended to its Minister that he request the following of the Minister of Natural Resources to ameliorate the destructive pressures bearing on Manitoba's game animals:

- a) as an immediate solution to the native hunting problem, a modified form of hunting licence should be created and instituted for the sole use of native hunters;
- b) current legislation should be amended to provide substantial minimum fines for those persons convicted of illegal hunting;
- c) the public should be made more aware that the conviction of a person engaged in illegal hunting can be obtained without disclosing the identity of the informant.

3. *Education Committee Briefs*

- 1) The MEC recommended to the Minister that a Government Environmental Network be set up in the Province of Manitoba, to facilitate an exchange of pertinent environmental information within the Provincial Government and between municipal governments.
- 2) The MEC recommended to the Minister that
 - a) workshops on how to express an appreciation for plant and animal life be an integral part of the training program for prospective child care workers;
 - b) "sensitization to our environment" workshops be held for current child care workers, and that follow-up materials should be provided to further aid in disseminating this concept;
 - c) "activities booklets" geared to fostering an appreciation of nature be made available to day care centres and nursery schools on a regular basis.
- 3) The MEC recommended to its Minister that he request the following of the Minister of Education:
 - a) that close lines of communication be developed with other agencies providing environmental education, especially those having interpretive centres, such as the Wildlife Foundation of Manitoba, the Manitoba Forestry Association, the City of Winnipeg, and the Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature;
 - b) that the Department of Education join with these agencies, the Department of Natural Resources and Environment, and other interested organizations in developing, funding and implementing comprehensive programs of environmental education for those grade levels that require them;
 - c) that effective in-service workshops and courses in environmental interpretation for teachers be

planned, funded, and implemented in co-operation with the above organizations and appropriate university departments.

4. *Environmental Chemical Committee Briefs*

- 1) The MEC recommended to the Minister that learning modules on insect pest control in Manitoba be developed and integrated into the high school science curriculum. Where aspects of this topic are presently included in modules, that the Minister co-operate with the Department of Education, where appropriate, to develop background and classroom materials which reflect current Manitoba situations.
- 2) The MEC recommended that public education on insect pest control be emphasized so that citizens are better informed about alternative methods of pest control and their relative advantages and disadvantages. One topic in particular that needed to be addressed was nuisance mosquito control.
- 3) The MEC recommended that a Pesticide Control Branch be established within the Environmental Management Division to regulate the use of, and provide information on pesticides in the province.

A Symposium on Hazardous and Special Waste was held on March 14-16, 1983, in Winnipeg. This symposium was funded by the Minister of Environment, organized by a steering committee composed of non-governmental agencies, and chaired by Bill Kennedy, immediate Past-Chairman of the MEC. Council took an active part in this important symposium.

Environment Week in Manitoba was celebrated June 5-15. Governor-General Edward Schreyer attended the opening ceremony on May 31, and signed an official proclamation. He presented the awards to winners of the MEC's cartoon contest.

The Publication Committee published the following reports:

- Annual Report 9 for the year 1981.
- Topic 1, Environmental Quality References.
- Study 15 — Tenth Anniversary Celebration.
- Annual Report 10 for the year 1982.

Environment Council of Alberta

Mr. Alistair Crerar, Chairman of the Environment Council of Alberta (ECA), presented this report.

The ECA is established as a crown corporation under the Environment Council Act. ECA has a separate vote for its funding. It reports to the Minister of Environment, but is not part of the Department, nor associated with it.

ECA has three principal approaches to fulfill its mandate:

- 1) **Public Advisory Committees:** these consist of more than 125 representatives from provincial organizations, not all of them environmentally concerned organizations. Thus the Committees serve as a sounding board for a cross-section of the population, and are able to identify environmental concerns and bring these to the attention of Council. Various study groups focus on specific areas of concern, e.g. pollution control, and often develop resolutions, which are brought to the ECA meetings, held in December of each year. If these are about matters of sufficient concern, and powerful enough to convince all members of the Public Advisory Committee, they are endorsed and sent as recommendations to the Minister. These groups have been very active in playing a watch dog role and alerting the public to matters of grave environmental concern.
- 2) **The Public Hearing Process:** hearings are held at the request of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, through an Order in Council. Terms of reference and a panel are established for each topic. The Executive Officer serves as Vice-Chairman of each public hearing.

ECA's current public hearings on "Maintenance and Expansion of the Agricultural Land-Base," were scheduled for November-December, 1983. Concerns included land loss to industrial development, including roads, gas wells and strip mines; reduction of soil productivity; salinization, acidity and loss of organic matter; potential for expansion of agriculture through irrigation or use of lands not now being used; and drainage.

Hearings would be held in 14 centres. As background, ECA had produced information bulletins and reports on 16 aspects of this topic, and so far 38,000 copies have been distributed. It was hoped that the public would find this information useful when presenting briefs. The Panel would then develop a report and recommendations to send to the Minister and the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

- 3) **Ongoing reviews of policies and programs of the government and government agencies:** ECA did a report on Environmental Standards. Council was presently conducting reviews of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, at the request of the Minister, and hoped to complete them and submit a report to the Minister in 1983.

ECA believes they have a reasonable record in spite of budgetary restraints.

Canadian Environmental Advisory Council

Mr. Tom Beck, the Chairman of the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council (CEAC), presented the Council's report.

The mandate of CEAC is primarily to provide advice to the Minister of the Environment. Council frequently provides voluntary advice.

Council currently has a dozen members, providing geographical representation from Prince Edward Island to B.C. and the Yukon. Its range of expertise is equally diverse. CEAC has a good working relationship with the Department of Environment.

This report by CEAC represents a slight departure of practice from past years, as it covers activities for the fiscal year, April 1, 1982 to March 31, 1983, rather than the period between assemblies. Since the period of time between assemblies varies from year to year, it was decided to ensure that a report could be provided for circulation in advance of future assemblies.

During the year, there were five meetings of the full Council, four executive meetings, and several meetings of committees, notably the Northern Committee and the Planning Committee for the Assembly.

1. Studies and Publications

No major studies were completed during the year, however, action was initiated on a country-wide review of "Sustainability of Agricultural Soils". An overview of current trends was completed this spring by Dr. Fred Bentley of Edmonton. An in-depth study with emphasis on economic aspects was being undertaken by Dr. Robert A. Hedlin and Dr. D.F. Kraft of Winnipeg. It was scheduled to be completed by March 31, 1984. These studies reflect a recommendation adopted at the 1981 Assembly in Banff.

Two publications, in addition to the CEAC annual report, were in preparation: "Selected Papers from Assemblies of the Environment Councils of Canada 1975-1980", and "Water Management Problems in the Third World: Lessons for Canada", the former prepared by Dr. Peter F.M. McLoughlin, Vice-Chairman of CEAC. The latter paper was originally presented at the 1982 Environment Week Symposium in Calgary.

2. Public Role

Demand remains strong for several CEAC documents. Council has received approximately 2,000 requests for copies of Dr. Ross Hall's report, "A New Approach to Pest Control in Canada."

Council members spoke on behalf of CEAC, or were active participants in discussions at several conferences, workshops and seminars. These included:

Environment Week Symposium (Calgary)
CO₂ Conference
ENGO National Meeting

DOE National Public Consultation Meeting
Western Region Director-Generals' Meeting
Whitehorse Workshop on Conservation Lands
Canadian Council on Ecological Areas
Risk Assessment Workshop (Halifax)
Canadian Association of Biologists.

3. Other Activities

Council was involved in varying degrees in a range of issues. Some were addressed on a one-time basis at meetings, while others are under study and scheduled for some form of future action, including recommendations to the Minister. The more significant issues included:

- Provision for environmental consideration in programs undertaken to stimulate economic recovery;
- Provision of a focal point for biotechnology within Environment Canada; development of adequate methods of assessing the environmental impact of biotechnological developments; and initiatives to encourage research and development, particularly those oriented toward environmentally beneficial applications;
- Application of a high priority to development and registration of biological control agents (pesticides), and a proposal to designate, within Environment Canada, one focal point for research and development work;
- Recommendation for deferral of a decision on the proposed shore-based facility at Stokes Point, Yukon, until the Beaufort Environmental Assessment Review is completed.
- Statement of principles which should govern decisions on the east coast seal hunt, and which should apply to harvesting of all species of wildlife.

Other subjects in which Council was involved included: environment-economy relationships; environmental aspects of Canadian foreign aid; Canadian State of the Environment Report; report of the Pesticides Workshop and the CCREM position on pesticides; wildlife matters, including a review of the role of the Canadian Wildlife Service; forestry programs; the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review Process; the Law Reform Commission's study on "Private Enforcement of Federal Environmental Legislation"; the DIAND Comprehensive Conservation Policy and Strategy for the NWT and Yukon; identification of critical issues and Environment Canada's priorities; Environment Canada and the North; environmental implications of the Olympics; acid rain; DOE policy development; and the DOE Strategic Plan.

Council also addressed aspects of its own role, including: its public role, its role in relation to the ENGO national meetings, and its relationship to Environment Canada, i.e. at the departmental, rather than the ministerial level.

Saskatchewan

Mr. H. Maliepaard, of the Saskatchewan Department of Environment, presented a report from that Province.

Since June, 1982, the Advisory Council had been on a holding pattern, while the government conducted a review and evaluation to determine how to most usefully employ such a Council. No date had been set to complete this review. Activities had virtually come to a standstill, except for the recent preparation of two reports:

1. need for a park system in Northern Saskatchewan;
2. paper outlining the decision-making process regarding environmental matters in Saskatchewan.

These would be made available to the public in the near future.

Ontario

Mr. W.B. Drowley, from the Ontario Department of Environment, stated that while no environmental advisory council exists in Ontario, there are specialized advisory boards, committees, etc. Consideration is presently being given to the establishment of an Environmental Standards Advisory Council.

Northwest Territories

Mr. J. Donihee, from the Department of Renewable Resources, reported for the Territories.

The Northwest Territories did not have an advisory council, since its mandate did not include responsibility for all en-

vironmental sectors, e.g., land and water. This created two problems: several government departments would have to be targets for advice; and the separation of management regulation and responsibilities might make it difficult for a Council to decide whom to advise.

At present, two formal mechanisms exist:

1. Science Advisory Board, an advisory body to the Legislative Assembly. A study on Baseline Information in the NWT on Acid Precipitation and the Long Range Transport of Air Pollutants (LRTAP) is underway. The Board is also studying heavy metal contamination in the NWT.
2. Hunters and Trappers Association of the NWT. Arrangements were made in May, 1983, for a meeting. The Association would first deal with the anti-trapping lobby and the effects it is having on the renewable resource economy and traditional lifestyles. It also planned to deal with some development issues, such as the Slave River hydro project. It was envisioned that this group might play a broader role, and advise the Minister on Parks initiatives, environmental and development-related problems.

The Department of Renewable Resources is developing a strategy for public information and participation in the policy and regulation development process. It is hoped that this initiative will resolve some of the difficulties in deciding to whom environmental issues should be addressed.

THE PUBLIC ROLE IN SETTING AND ENFORCING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS

Introduction

Mr. Alistair Crerar, Chief Executive Officer, Environment Council of Alberta, introduced a report entitled "Environmental Standards: A Comparative Study of Canadian Standards, Standard Setting Processes and Enforcement", by A.R. Lucas, M.A.H. Franson and R.J. Franson.

Mr. Crerar said that this report originated out of discussions at the VIth Assembly of Councils, held in Banff in 1981. At that time, a need was identified for a comparative study of environmental standards throughout Canada, and it was suggested that the Alberta Council undertake such a study and report back at the following meeting. However, the report was not completed until the autumn of 1982, too late for presentation in Nova Scotia. Since the idea for the report originated at an assembly of councils, the Alberta Council decided it would be appropriate to table it for public release at the present Assembly.

The report examined how environmental standards are established federally and provincially, and the similarities which may exist among them. Due to the magnitude of the task, only four provinces — Alberta, B.C., Saskatchewan and Ontario — were studied. Canadian federal standards were also compared with standards set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The other major aspect of the report was the enforcement of standards.

The study was conducted by Mr. Alistair Lucas of Calgary, a lawyer concerned with environmental law, and a member of the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council. He was assisted by the Fransons, of the University of British Columbia, who provided material on biological engineering.

Review of Report

Mr. Lucas reviewed the report. He allowed time for discussion and questions, and encouraged the group to develop recommendations if they were thought to be needed.

Identification and Comparison of Standards

The term "standards" as used in the study could be defined, Mr. Lucas said, as "an accepted norm of conduct". Standards which are not legally enforceable would be characterized as guidelines, or in some cases, as policy.

Standards for the federal and four provincial jurisdictions were

identified and tabulated, after which officials were interviewed. A literature search of U.S. federal standards was conducted. Standards examined were air standards, water standards, and standards for disposal of contaminants on land (e.g. landfill).

The biological and engineering team then converted these standards to common units of measurement to facilitate comparison. A problem encountered was that the numbers were often expressed in different units. Sometimes it was impossible to convert to common units because some standards were geared to particular plant processes. In some instances, they were expressed in ways which made comparison very difficult. For example, Ontario's air standards are set on a "point of impingement" basis, which means impingement by a contaminant stream on a receptor located according to formulae set out in the Ontario regulations. This made it very difficult to get a comparison between a point of impingement standard and an air standard which generally involves a sampling at the stack base.

Seven industries were chosen for the study of emission standards. They were: petroleum refineries, natural gas processing plants, pulp and paper mills, municipal sewage treatment plants, municipal solid waste disposal sites, coal-fired electric generating plants, and chemical plants (particularly chlor-alkali, vinyl chloride, fertilizer, and phosphate fertilizer plants). Information on these was set out in tabular form, to make it possible to compare contaminants of particular kinds.

Generally speaking, Canadian standards were more stringent than expected, particularly in relation to the U.S. standards. There seemed to be a tendency for the provinces to adopt federal standards, particularly national emission standards.

A number of gaps were found, some quite inexplicable. Some provinces, for example, had no standard for hydrocarbons which are a significant component of photo-chemical smog resulting from automobile gas emissions. In Alberta there was no standard for residual chlorine in water. Recently, there have been problems with fish kill in Alberta's Elbow River, apparently caused by residual chlorine.

Process by which Standards are Set

An attempt was made to develop an idealized conceptual standard-setting process. This was used as a framework, but some problems were inherent in the approach. It was used for comparing what actually happens in various provinces, and how differing provincial standards are formulated. Basically, the standard-setting process involves five steps:

- (1) *Formulation of Objectives*: This involved determining primary uses of the air, water or land resources, in order to determine the degree of purity to be aimed for in setting standards. The formulation of objectives involved certain value judgments. In certain jurisdictions, some resources were seen as more important than in others, e.g. fisheries in B.C. as compared to Saskatchewan.
- (2) *Selection of Criteria*: This is a scientific process which involves gathering and compiling data on various pollutants, or the level of air and water quality in relation to the uses to be protected. These data will help to determine levels that offer various degrees of protection.
- (3) *Setting of Ambient Standards*: This involves consideration of costs, political acceptability and other judgments, as well as the scientific and technical criteria.
- (4) *Standards for Particular Emissions*: Sources must be monitored and regulated to ensure ambient standards are maintained. The study tended to overlook mobile sources (e.g. motor vehicles) because of the difficulty of dealing with them in the context of the study, and concentrated on fixed sources, i.e., plants. Establishment of effluent standards involves technical, economic and political considerations. There is always flexibility in determining the level of protection to be achieved. Dr. Andrew Thompson's study for the Westwater Research Centre states that negotiation is the essence of environmental standard-setting. This study has become the Economic Council of Canada's reference on regulation.
- (5) *Process of Standard-Setting*: None of the jurisdictions seemed to have clearly defined goals and objectives for the process of standard-setting. The crucial judgment factor was often obscured, making the process used appear wholly scientific or technical.

It was found that the federal-provincial committees responsible for setting national ambient air quality standards have had a substantial influence.

Many jurisdictions seem to incorporate standards without thorough knowledge as to how the standards were set, and regardless of whether or not they are appropriate to their needs.

Alberta, B.C., and the federal government have used industry-government task forces for establishing standards.

Unfortunately, the public is not usually involved, except in B.C., where public hearings are used. B.C. has proceeded on an industry-by-industry basis, setting up panels of technical experts and people with knowledge of each industry. Studies

are also commissioned to help set standards for particular industries. B.C.'s new Environment Management Act provides for initial hearings for the standard-setting process, and a review of the standards of each particular industry after five years, followed by another set of public hearings and a revised set of standards.

There is little pressure for public participation, except in Ontario. Here it stems largely from the controversy over the hazardous chemicals leaking into the Niagara River, and the effects on drinking water. While there are hundreds of contaminants, standards have been established for a relatively small number. The necessary scientific work has not been done to determine the effects of the others.

The study concluded that public participation should be an essential part of standard setting. This would reinforce accountability of those setting the standards. It would also provide guidance and support for officials faced with value judgments, especially those involving human health, and enhance public understanding of the risks and trade-offs involved. Public consultation would also serve to balance direct dealings with industry.

Enforcement

This is probably the shallowest part of the study because of the lack of empirical data, particularly pertaining to the extent of non-compliance in industry. An empirical study is also needed on the extent of enforcement action taken as a consequence. Methods of enforcement, particularly criminal prosecutions, were studied. Most environmental statutes provide that where there is a breach of requirements an offence has been committed. A number of problems were identified:

- (1) *Due Diligence Defence*: protects a company or an individual charged with a breach of standard, providing they can prove that due diligence was used in operations to ensure the standard was not breached, even though a breach may have occurred. The standards are usually set out in a licence or permit which has been negotiated, to some extent, with the company concerned. A company which has undertaken to meet the standards outlined in the permit, and breaches those standards, will be charged. This is precisely the purpose of the licence, i.e., to set down the standards and make it perfectly clear that the company which undertook to meet these standards, and has been charged, is allowed to plead its case. An inconsistency exists here that is not characteristic of criminal charges generally. The due diligence defence is designed to prevent people from ending up with criminal records if they can prove not to be morally at fault. It is imperative to define whether a breach of an environmental standard was initially included in a permit or licence issued under a pollution control statute. In effect, what has been done is to put

the risk, not on the permittee, but on the public. This is the crux of the matter.

- (2) *Burden of Proof is on the Prosecution:* the “beyond reasonable doubt” standard is a high standard deemed appropriate in a criminal law context. The standards are written into a company’s permit, and the company knowingly undertakes to abide by them, but there are problems in establishing a legal level of proof necessary to meet the standard of “beyond reasonable doubt”. There have been cases in which charges were dismissed because, although stack emissions were monitored every few minutes and the result showed pollution exceeding the allowed limit, the judge was not sure what happened in the intervals between monitoring of samples.
- (3) *Fines:* A low limit has been set by legislation, so that no one worries too much about prosecution. Fines are considered as just another cost of doing business.

The study concluded that the whole rationale for using criminal prosecution as a main technique for enforcement of environmental standards needs further scrutiny. Because of the difficulties outlined, authorities usually choose not to prosecute, but to negotiate with the polluter instead, often causing public outcry. This results in public disrespect for the process of environmental standard-setting and enforcement, and the public become increasingly cynical about the commitment of governments to these goals. It is recommended that:

- (a) Alternative techniques be studied, including the use of contracts which can be enforced in a non-criminal way. Control orders could be used, as in Ontario.
- (b) Public information be provided to remedy the general ignorance of problems involved in standard setting and enforcement. This lack of knowledge and information creates a credibility gap. An effort should be made to document the successes, as well as the failings of the process.

Environmental councils could play a role in the public information process, in public involvement in the process of standard-setting, and perhaps, in various ways, in public involvement in the enforcement process.

Discussion

Discussion of the report focussed on the following main areas.

Public Consultation and Involvement

It was noted that Québec regulations are subject to a public consultation period of sixty days prior to adoption by Cabinet. Mr. Lucas was asked whether the study mentioned the existence of a similar mandatory period of public consultation in any of the jurisdictions reviewed.

Mr. Lucas said that none were found, except in B.C., where public hearings are held. Some federal standards, such as the national emission guidelines on air, have been published in the *Canada Gazette*, and an opportunity to comment has been provided. This was the only example found of a notice and comment provision. No concrete examples were found of standards being significantly modified as a result of comments.

The comment was made that in Québec, when the public consultation process has been put aside, it has been because of political considerations. This should never be allowed to happen, because public participation educates, and brings about changes in attitude. The environment is a public affair and should be treated as such.

Mr. Lucas was asked why there has been a shift in B.C. away from public involvement in the setting and enforcing of standards. Mr. Lucas said he was not sure of the reason. Groups and individuals who have been involved have generally considered the results to be positive. He thought the process might have been streamlined because it had been criticized as costly and time-consuming.

It was felt that Councils have a major role to play with regard to public participation. In Québec, the Advisory Council can comment, make recommendations to the Minister, and even consult the public, since regulations are published sixty days before being adopted. Public consultation should be part of the process, whether in the form of public hearings or other procedures. However, since the subjects are often very technical, formal public participation should take place at the objective-setting and criteria-setting stage.

Ambient Standards

Mr. Lucas was asked if ambient standards are called objectives, and if it is possible to legislate a standard for the ambient environment. Two problems were mentioned: (1) In at least one jurisdiction, power commissions are talking about the “bubble concept” of ambient air standards, whereby the thermal power stations can juggle their operations according to the weather, to maintain the same level of air quality without treating all plants to the same level of effluent control, and (2) the most significant effluent residue in North America, in regard to water quality, may come from non-point sources. This is especially so in farming areas and may require modification of traditional farming practices. This will take time and education, and cannot be achieved through permits or criminal charges. Also, there are no standards for various kinds of plants, e.g. vastly differing pulp and paper mills, making negotiation a large part of the process. For other major polluting industries it may not be necessary to write standards for a plant in a smaller jurisdiction.

Mr. Lucas agreed that elaborate industry-by-industry standards are not needed in smaller jurisdictions. In populous provinces, emphasis is on total waste loading adjusted to assimilative capacity, so emission standards must be applied across the board.

Mr. Lucas said that most jurisdictions, in setting emission standards, refer to ambient standards as objectives to be met. It is a problem that emissions from plant to plant are not uniform, and in Alberta, that varying time periods are used in setting ambient standards.

Alternatives to Regulation

Members were impressed by the statement that the essence of standard setting is negotiation — involving technical, scientific, economic, political and social considerations; that the challenge is not so much the definition of abstract standards, but the application of regulations and standards already set. The problem seems to be shifting from regulation to management. There had been cases where regulations were met with such social or economic resistance that they could not be enforced.

Members commented on the difficulty of achieving fairness in defining variable standards on a regional basis. How could a uniform environmental policy be achieved? There was support for the recommendation for ongoing research in this area.

Mr. Lucas said that this could lead to a cost/benefit discussion. Alternatives to regulation were dealt with very briefly in the report. The Law Reform Commission of Canada was currently studying alternatives to prosecution, such as contracts, mediation, etc. An extensive study had been done on the enforcement regulations under the Fisheries Act by the Environmental Protection Service, and it would be released shortly. Some Canadian work was being done in response to the U.S. studies.

Enforcement

It was suggested that the “due diligence” defence was being used often and successfully; that the legal system has severe limitations because of the lack of understanding of sampling in statistical theory; and that this in turn made it difficult to convince the public that the standards set were reasonable.

Mr. Lucas agreed, and said it is becoming more and more difficult for prosecutors to obtain convictions. Companies were developing elaborate written guidelines and instructions for their employees, to be quoted in court if charged for breach of standards.

It was suggested that most of the standards, laws and regulations were established prior to the Sault Ste. Marie decision

which makes it possible for almost anyone to claim reasonable diligence as a defence. Mr. Lucas was asked whether the various governmental and non-governmental agencies have adapted to this decision by attempting to change their standards to strict prohibitions which preclude individuals invoking the famous Sault Ste. Marie decision. Mr. Lucas said that by and large, provinces had not adapted in light of the Sault Ste. Marie case. If the offences were changed to “strict liability” or “absolute liability” offences, the only proof needed would be that the event had occurred, and that the person or company charged was the cause. By and large, that has not been done: a reason may be that lawyers who advise governments are concerned with civil rights and criminal law protection, and have not grasped the fact that a problem exists and has to be dealt with in a different way. For example, Ontario issues control orders, which result in detailed documentation: offences can be rewritten to exclude the due diligence defence.

One member commented that while he was in Egypt, it was reported to the Irrigation Minister that a plant was discharging untreated effluents into a canal. The plant was closed within the hour. Maybe Canada should take this route, instead of going to court for two or three years, and spending a great deal of money, with the defendant eventually going free.

Other

- It was noted that there are vast differences in drinking water standards among the various jurisdictions. It was suggested that all provinces should adopt the federal standards for drinking water.
- A question was raised regarding one of the tables in the report entitled “Coliform Fecal Domestic Supply”. Mr. Lucas replied that coliform bacteria had been used as an indicator of the general bacteria level in water quality tests; that the fecal coliform level for drinking water should be zero after treatment; and the higher the count the higher the treatment levels.
- It would be impractical and exorbitantly expensive to replicate the research that preceded the establishment of criteria. Most jurisdictions, when setting standards, borrow the research or standards of other jurisdictions. For example, Ontario uses International Joint Commission standards established under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, and these are in turn based on World Health Organization standards.

Recommendations

The discussion on two recommendations related to this report took place during the plenary session at the end of the

Assembly. The summary of that discussion has been included in this section of the report for convenience.

The Environment Council of Alberta presented the following recommendation for consideration by the Advisory Councils:

1. "The joint Advisory Councils request that the Federal Department of the Environment undertake an investigation and review of alternatives to existing methods of regulating and enforcing environmental standards.

Explanation: The Economic Council of Canada has recommended the use of economic rewards and penalties as alternatives or supplements to environmental regulation.

Professor Lucas had pointed out the weakness of the existing criminal law model as the basis for all existing environmental regulation. Legal alternatives, such as contract law, should be investigated for their strengths and weaknesses and applicability to regulation and enforcement of environmental standards in Canada.

Because of the universal nature of legal and economic alternatives to existing regulatory processes, it would be appropriate for Environment Canada to support such a recommendation."

In the discussion of Recommendation No. 1, Mr. Lucas pointed out that the reference to "Environment Canada" should be changed to "the federal Council", because the consensus at the workshop was that CEAC could provide a more independent evaluation. There was agreement on this change.

It was noted that CEAC does not have the authority to conduct "investigations" but does conduct reviews of documents, reports, etc., and therefore could undertake a "review of alternatives".

Concern was expressed by CEAC members that the Council might be incapable of conducting such a review, given the constraints of its research budget, whereas the Department of Environment and the Law Reform Commission have both capability and resources. Provincial representatives felt that the review should be conducted by a federal body, since the basis of law applies universally to the federal government and to all the provinces. It was proposed that CEAC undertake to conduct the review, given freedom of method and approach. It might get input from DOE, the Law Reform Commission and the Department of Justice, through suasion or any means available.

It was noted that the Law Reform Commission would like to get members of other groups and the public involved in the scrutiny of proposals being developed, and that CEAC was already receiving draft reports from the Commission on which it would report back to councils. It was also suggested that there be further examination of the Economic Council of Canada's proposal to use economic rewards and penalties as an alternative to criminal law. A new form of contract law might be required.

It was suggested that ideas be circulated to all councils before the next meeting. Reservations were expressed about this approach because it implied a degree of liaison among councils which does not exist. It was thought best for CEAC to go ahead with the study if resources were available from other organizations, and come back with the results, with the understanding that it would not be the end of the study.

A second recommendation which had been developed during the workshops was presented at the final plenary session the following day:

2. "That each council review ways and means for public input in the process of establishing and reviewing environmental standards. Standards include maximum contaminant levels in ambient air and water as well as maximum levels for contaminant emissions into air and water.

Explanation: The process of establishing environmental standards is not solely a scientific or technical matter. Significant value judgments are involved as to what objectives to pursue and generally what degree of risk to accept. Public consultation can provide important input on this basic question of acceptable degree of risk. It can also reinforce accountability in environment of officials responsible for standard-setting.

Public involvement in standard-setting is a two-way process in that it can help to educate and inform the public on the difficulties and complexities of standard-setting and enforcement of standards. Apparent public suspicion about the adequacy of standards and about apparent lack of vigour in enforcement, may be reduced."

In discussion on Recommendation No.2, members emphasized the importance of Mr.Lucas' comments on the public role in standard-setting, and the other comments made during the review of the report.

Throughout the discussion there was agreement on the importance of public involvement in standard-setting. There was no disagreement voiced on the general thrust of the recommendation, but there were some reservations regarding wording, particularly the inclusion of "maximum levels of contaminant emissions".

On the one hand it was argued that the setting of ambient standards could not be dealt with in the context of setting maximum levels of contaminant emissions. This implied universality of application. There should be opportunity for specific applications. Discharges from single point sources should be dealt with on an individual basis. The opposing view was that some contaminants were regulated with respect

to both ambient and emission standards, and that regulation is the only opportunity for public input. The establishment of emission standards is the only practical way of achieving this.

One compromise suggested was that the word "maximum" be deleted in order to provide a more general content.

Members agreed with the principle on which the recommendation was based, regardless of any problems which might exist with regard to wording, or differing interpretations placed on the wording. What was needed was a national endorsement of public right to make a contribution in the setting of environmental standards.

ROLE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCILS

Introduction

This subject was the main theme of the Assembly. Presentations, workshops and discussions started at noon on June 6 and continued until the afternoon of June 7. Four of the five main addresses presented at the Assembly were devoted to this subject and summaries of those addresses have been included in this section of the report.

The objective of this session was not to define a standard role for all councils but rather to identify and weigh a range of possibilities. It was recognized that the exact role of each council would have to reflect the requirements of its jurisdiction and the circumstances of the time.

A three-pronged approach was used in the examination of the role of councils:

- The Role in Relation to the Public;
- The Relationship of Councils to Government Departments; and
- The Role of Councils in Relation to the Ministers of the Environment.

These themes were followed, in part, in the special addresses which were referred to above, and by the workshop groups. Each of the groups was asked to give priority to one of the above themes and to provide a written report on that theme as a basis for discussion during the plenary session. Workshop groups were provided with sets of questions on each theme to prompt discussion. The Guide for Working Groups has been included in this Report as Annex E. The reports of the working groups appear as Annexes F, G, and H. The membership of each group appears in Annex D.

A Cabinet Minister's View of Environmental Advisory Councils

A summary of the luncheon address on June 7 by the Honourable John Roberts, Federal Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Roberts addressed delegates on the final day of the Assembly and, speaking extemporaneously, related his remarks to the kind of questions under discussion among members of the councils. This is a summary of the main points made by Mr. Roberts in his talk, and during the subsequent discussion.

In his opening remarks Mr. Roberts discussed a minister's relationship to four groups: his constituents, the public advocacy type of environmental organization, a ministerial advisory group, and civil service expert advisors. He suggested that the Canadian parliamentary system is, like the judicial system

and labour-management relations, a system of institutionalized confrontation: it is an adversarial system, and one in which the media adopt positions in relationship to the government of the day.

In this context, Mr. Roberts identified two kinds of councils: one whose primary role is to arouse and inform public opinion, and the other whose relationship is essentially as an advisor to a Minister of the Crown. The role of the public advocacy type of organization is a legitimate and valuable means of representing in a formal way, to Parliament and to ministers, the interests of its constituency. A minister must deal with this kind of organization as one of the many political elements with which he is engaged.

The ministerial advisory kind of organization, on the other hand, may develop a relationship of confidentiality with a minister and, being aware of many of the considerations he has in mind, offer very useful and immediate advice. Mr. Roberts stated that such a council, established to advise the minister, must by definition establish a role compatible with the minister's own role — that is, compatible with the nature of politics and politicians, and the broad constituency to which they are accountable. This role, he suggested, requires "a certain passion for anonymity in the public area".

The logical conclusion of this is that such a council is essentially an instrument of the minister. No subservience is implied: it is a useful instrument only to the degree that it offers forthright expression of the concerns of its members and the constituencies to which they individually relate. On the one hand, a ministerial advisory council should avoid tempering its expressed views to accommodate a minister; on the other hand a council cannot properly engage in public controversy with a minister. Any Minister of the Environment will ordinarily prefer to have public discussion than not to have it. "But that's a decision he has to make . . . I think you have to leave that to him. Don't sandbag the Minister".

Generally, a minister's advisory council is not the conduit through which people should make representations to a government: there are alternative means — through Members of Parliament, by direct letter, and via environmental councils and groups of the public advisory type.

Regarding government departments, Mr. Roberts said that while they do provide expert advice on the substance of a question, they are pyramidal structures, and tend to develop "a consensus of advice", the conventional wisdom of a department. A minister's expertise is supposed to be in finding out what the public wants and providing for it, or deciding what the public needs and convincing them they should have it, or somewhere in between.

"It is tremendously important to a minister to have access to people who can give a view which is not that of the department but which is equally rooted in knowledge of the questions and of public sentiment . . . One of the extraordinarily valuable things that a ministerial council can do is to supplement and balance the kind of advice which a minister will receive from his departmental officials". A council should have an open relationship with departmental experts, and should have full information exchange with them. But the council should be aware of the inevitable tendency of a department to absorb or co-opt an advisory body.

Turning to more specific aspects of the role of council, Mr. Roberts observed that it is important that the council serve as "a kind of early warning system" to identify environmental issues which are developing, and forewarn the minister. The mechanics of government are cumbersome. The period of response is slow, but there are issues which the environmental community cares about. Ministers should be forewarned of an impending need for decision, opinion, or the need for development of an approach.

Ministerial councils also have a role "in a proper, responsible way, to stimulate effective public discussion of issues". Environmental councils should take up "not only the work of educating and informing the minister, but educating and informing the public whose knowledge of environmental matters is . . . so often the product of media which may, or may not, be responsible in communicating those issues to the public".

There are complex environmental questions which raise the whole issue of proper use of knowledge, of science with its often-conflicting views. In some areas we have insufficient information. In other areas we have a great deal of information which we may or may not be able to interpret.

How can we achieve rational action in the inevitable absence of full knowledge? We need assessment of risk, and assessment of when we have enough knowledge to act. There is risk in acting; there is risk in not acting. And there is the acute problem of communication among governments, the public, and the media.

More generally apropos the role of a council, Mr. Roberts went on to speak about the definition of the word "environment". If it is defined as the ecological system comprising the natural resources, then clearly it is a concern of the environmental movement in Canada, and of a council which reflects and responds to that constituency. That is one matter. If, however, "environment" is seen as embracing ecology, economy, and social organization, that is another matter. The latter definition comes close to coinciding with a politician's definition of politics. Environmental considerations would, by the broader definition, embrace most of society's aspirations, and

would pre-empt many functions of politicians — who conceive that their role in relation to society is to define and implement the whole range of social objectives.

On the other side of the same coin, the basic disposition of environmentalists necessarily leads them to view the universe and nature, and man's role therein, as a seamless web of interrelationships.

Because of subjectivity or vagueness in the working definition of "environment" up to now, Mr. Roberts said he discerned "a tension between the political process and the kind of environmental process we're working toward . . . The question of definition is not merely a semantic one . . . (it has) very real implications for what the responsibilities of politicians are to be, and what the responsibilities of environmentalists are to be". A question not yet fully resolved is how to reconcile two entirely valid but overlapping perceptions of responsibility, or find some synthesis that will bring them together.

The Public Point of View on the Role of Environmental Advisory Councils

A summary of the luncheon address on June 6 by Dr. David Brooks, Marbek Resource Consultants, Ltd.

Mr. Beck introduced the speaker, commenting that the reason Dr. Brooks had been invited to address the Assembly was because of his great contribution to the constructive relationship existing between CEAC and environmental non-government organizations, initiated by the federal Council several years ago. Dr. Brooks has a Master's degree in Geology and a Ph.D. in Economics. At one time he was Chief Economist of the Division of Mineral Economics with the U.S. Bureau of Mines. In 1970, he became Chief of the Mineral Economics Research Division for Energy, Mines and Resources. He was subsequently appointed the first director of Canada's Office of Energy Conservation in 1974. Three years later he resigned to assume the coordination of the Ottawa Office of Energy Probe. He is presently a Director and Past-President of Friends of the Earth in Canada, and a principal with Marbek Resource Consultants. He is the author of numerous books and papers.

Dr. Brooks said that he proposed to talk about advisory councils which deal with environmental issues in the broadest sense, rather than those which have a narrow, explicit function, such as the associate committees of the National Research Council, and the research advisory committees of Energy, Mines and Resources. He pointed out that the councils dealing with broad issues are of two types — those for whom the audience is the minister, and those for whom the audience is the public. Both types are equally valid, but it is impossible for a council to serve both functions effectively.

The federal CEAC serves, in a sense, as a private consulting group and think-tank for the minister. To be effective, it must have access to confidential information. Its publications, such as the paper on ecotoxicity, will play a secondary role and will be aimed at environmental colleagues. It will not generally be possible to publish papers to get the public interested in an issue while at the same time attempting to advise the minister on that issue.

The people to serve on this type of council will be selected primarily for their intellectual qualifications, and only secondarily for breadth of representation. Financial and staff requirements will be relatively modest.

Problems may arise if staff members of the department come to view CEAC as a court of last resort, and ask CEAC to intercede with the minister. This may be a useful role if it is done only occasionally. But the main objective must be to influence the minister to go a step beyond issues which are merely current.

The purpose of other type of council is to stir up, interest and inform the public. Publications and dealings with the media are critical, and secrecy is antithetical to the interests of council. It is important that members be truly representative, whether ethnically, economically, linguistically or geographically. Financial costs, and staff requirements for research and organization will be much greater than for councils which serve a minister.

The danger for this type of council is that the public, or even the government, may try to use it as an environmental review process. That would divert from the main objective, which is to capture the public's attention and interest, and to foster momentum to achieve goals.

Dr. Brooks remarked that at this point, while thinking out the contrast between ministerial advisory councils and publicly-oriented ones, he began to realize the similarities between them, since many of the problems they face are identical. Both depend on two things: the ability to amass information and intelligently analyze a problem; and an achievement of trust and confidence. As an example, a lot of good information developed by the Atomic Energy Commission is ignored because the Commission has lost the confidence of the public.

Both kinds of council must on occasion respond to short-term issues. A request may come from the minister, or the public may get exercised about a particular issue because it is on the front page of *The Globe and Mail*. But the main focus has to go beyond immediate interests, to problems that would not otherwise have priority with the minister or the

public. A couple of examples are CEAC's study on ecotoxicity, and the results of that study, and the Québec Council's paper on Biomass Energy, published three or four years ago, a subject which is only now being recognized as an important issue.

It is necessary for councils to be in the forefront — identifying issues, developing recommendations, fostering awareness and expanding consciousness. The minister may sometimes need to be given a little extra courage, as well.

Dr. Brooks cautioned that councils are required to perform a tough balancing act. Statements must be based on information from the best sources available, and on good analysis. However, where doubt or uncertainty exists on any given issue, councils must come down on the side of protection of the environment. A council must never say, "Well, it appears that there are some dangers here but we don't yet have enough information to act."

Dr. Brooks remarked that his scientific training had made him recognize the need to question information and analysis. He also cautioned against dismissing emotional arguments as irrational. Someone's desire to use the wood on park land for commercial purposes is not more valid than another person's wish to enjoy the land in its untouched natural state.

One of the greatest deficiencies of environmental advisory bodies, in Dr. Brooks' view, is their lack of operational statements and concrete policies. It is not the function of councils to get into regulation, but the thrust of their conclusions must be operational.

The role of councils will become more difficult as environmental issues get more complex. Acid rain may be the last of the relatively simple issues. Increasingly, environmentalism is interlaced with decentralization and other essentially social constraints. The critical value choices that must be made will be of great importance to the future environmental well-being of Canada and other countries.

The work of councils will also be made more difficult by the increasing sophistication of the people involved. The people involved with the environmental non-government organizations of the early and mid-1970's were less knowledgeable than they are today. This is true also of government analysts and corporation executives.

How can councils deal with all the problems — the broader range of issues, the need to consider decentralization and scale effects, along with biological and ecological effects — the prospect of becoming less popular, as they make things more difficult for the ministers and the public?

"How can you reconcile all that? I would simply say: 'That's your problem!' That's why you're here".

Dr. Brooks' address was followed by questions and discussion.

It was observed that according to what Dr. Brooks had just said, the Environment Council of Alberta must be a bumblebee which can't fly, because it serves two masters, the public and the Minister. Its public advisory committees meet regularly, have free access to the press, and generate information to educate the public. The Council also deals at public hearings with questions directed to it by the Minister, and reports to him. What did Dr. Brooks advise?

Dr. Brooks suggested that perhaps the Council should be divided into two parts. When he spoke about the type of council whose audience is the minister he did not mean those which report back to him on the results of public hearings. He meant the type of council which has access to confidential information from the minister and which sits down with him to advise him on that basis.

Dr. Brooks was asked to clarify his comments about the actors becoming more sophisticated, and his apparent indication that this was a problem. Would he paraphrase this to mean that some of the public are gaining a greater appreciation of the positions and problems of people on the corporate and government side, and vice versa? This could be a hopeful sign, pointing toward cooperative problem-solving between these traditionally opposed sectors.

Dr. Brooks replied that, if he had left the impression that this increased sophistication was a problem, he did not mean to do so. He was, on the contrary, very encouraged by it. He meant that it is a problem in that, as issues become more complicated, it will not be possible to choose sides and know automatically who is on them. Simplistic approaches will not be possible. In Ontario, we have seen some environmental groups supporting, and some opposing, a government proposal to burn PCB's in the cement plants. Industries will increasingly take two sides on issues — a very hopeful sign.

A Manitoba View on the Role of Environmental Councils

A summary of the address by Dr. A.C. Maniar, Chairman, Manitoba Environmental Council, on June 6.

Dr. Maniar was introduced by Mr. Beck. Dr. Maniar came to Canada in 1958, and to Manitoba in 1964. He holds a Ph.D. in microbiology, and a D.Sc. in Antibiotics. His main professional contribution has been in the field of public health.

Dr. Maniar began with a brief examination of the reasons why environmental councils are needed. He stressed the need for

a balanced approach, with protection and preservation of the environment, control of pollution, and human health as all-important components.

He then proceeded to present three options for the organization and operation of environmental councils, outlining the advantages and disadvantages of each.

Option 1

Council could be a free-standing body, with its own staff and independent offices, neither profit-oriented nor involved with voluntary organizations. It could receive core funding from governments and solicit funds from other sources.

Advantages:

With command of its own resources and staff, a council would be free to choose its own direction;
Its independence to adopt advocacy positions would be unimpeded;
Visibility would be heightened;
Council would not be perceived as an arm of government by the community at large.

Disadvantages:

Lack of access to support staff and technical staff would necessitate a much larger budget;
Council would lose the right of direct access to the minister, and become one among many environmentally concerned groups;
Council might lose its appeal to many of its current members, precisely due to the loss of the advisory role and direct access to the minister;
The Executive and Board would have to divert significantly more resources to management and budgeting concerns than is done at present;
Council would be vulnerable to the withholding of government funding during times of high resistance or strong controversy over an issue, or when a council opposed government policies.

Option 2

Council could be given considerable autonomy while still being funded by the department, and acting in an advisory capacity to the minister.

The degree of autonomy would include an objective defence of budget, and the prerogative of the Chairman to determine activities.

Advantages:

Council would be separate from the department,

rather than being “buried”, and assuming a role not related to its size or scope;
Council would gain a heightened public profile;
Some of the historical tensions would be partially, if not completely, resolved.

Disadvantages:

Council staff would lose contact with colleagues, and lose relationships developed over time;
Change in focus might divert attention of council from the fundamental organizational and staffing issues which have to be addressed.

Option 3

Council could retain its organization as an advisory body, situated within the environmental management division. (This situation exists in Manitoba.)

Advantages:

Advisory role would be maintained. Council would retain access to the Department of Environment, and a level of resources which is only marginally satisfactory;
No changes in legislation or regulations would be necessary;
Capacity to direct staff would be increased.

Disadvantages:

Council would remain only a small part of a much larger body;
Council's role and work would likely be viewed as a low priority within the department;
Fiscal management would remain a problem.

Manitoba Council

Dr. Maniar then proceeded to outline in detail the organization and mode of operation of the Manitoba Environmental Council. It is an autonomous body, with a fixed budget provided by Government. Extra funds are granted by the Minister for special purposes.

The Council is directly responsible to the Minister, and meets with him, or writes to him whenever needed. Frequently Council goes to the Deputy Minister for assistance. The Minister proposes short-term and long-term problems for Council to address.

The Manitoba Council plays an advisory role, hence a request from the Minister must be given first priority, which sometimes may pose problems.

Manitoba Council has 95 members from the public at large.

There are technical and professional representatives from various regions, who bring to Council the environmental concerns specific to those regions.

Committees exist to deal with specific subjects, such as education, wildlife, chemicals and water. A few members of Council serve on each committee.

Eight to ten briefs, on an average, are prepared and submitted to the Minister each year. They are usually discussed at the meetings of the Board and, if approved, are presented to the Council meeting by the committee chairmen. Both the Minister and the public are aware that briefs are approved by full Council, and this develops an atmosphere of trust.

All Council meetings are open to the public, and Council receives letters from the public about their concerns.

Manitoba Council averages two to five publications a year. Copies of these are sent to the Minister.

The Clean Environment Commission refers some issues to the Council.

The Council was formed in 1972. The Honourable Lloyd Axworthy was its first Chairman. It has received continuous input from the public.

Dr. Maniar concluded with an emphasis on the importance to environmental councils of gaining the confidence of both public and government.

A short period for questions and answers followed. Dr. Maniar was asked what the Clean Environment Commission is, and its relationship to the Manitoba Council. He replied that it is a coordinating and liaison body of the Department of the Environment.

Dr. Maniar was asked if the Manitoba Council found a difference in reporting to the Deputy Minister instead of the Minister. He said that the Deputy Minister is a member of the advisory body. The Minister sometimes assigns work to the Deputy Minister, and Council works directly with him. Copies of briefs submitted to the Minister are sent to the Deputy Minister.

General Council meetings are held at least twice a year. The Board, composed of 40 people, meets ten times in one year. The Executive Secretary is a civil servant. The Membership Committee consists of the Chairman, the Executive Secretary, and two members including one Board member. Applications and suggestions for membership from the public are scrutinized by this Committee, and the final decisions are made by

the Board of Directors. Members are appointed by the Minister for a term of two years.

It was observed that some provinces, including B.C., have a strong opposition, culturally and politically, to this type of council. He was asked how the Manitoba Council started, and why it assumed its present form.

Dr. Maniar responded that the Minister of the Environment in 1972, the Honourable Sid Green, wanted a council to advise him. Mr. Axworthy, the first Chairman, was given *carte blanche* to form the Council. A constitution was drawn up, which is amended every year. The aim of the Council was to bring together a diverse group of concerned environmentalists to advise the Minister and influence public opinion. The Council tends to identify with public views, rather than those of the government, and since briefs are made public, the onus is on the Minister to take appropriate action in response.

Living in Harmony with our Planet

Mr. Jacques Gérin, Deputy Minister, Environment Canada, addressed the dinner meeting of the Assembly on June 6, 1983. This is a condensed version of his remarks.

* * *

It is a happy coincidence that the Assembly of Environmental Councils brings together, at the beginning of Environment Week, people from all over the country who hold compatible views.

It is good to be able to speak together about the environment and those subjects which concern us all. I would rather not address the question of the role of environmental councils, but would prefer to talk about environmental issues *per se*. I want to talk about living in harmony with this planet, in a way that will be of relevance to environmental councils. As the willing beneficiary of a lot of advice from them, I intend to make the most of this opportunity tonight to give some advice in return.

One has to remember that the environmental movement was born in conflict, as most new thrusts are. It grew, in the late '60s and early '70s, out of a very real alarm at the destructive things we were doing to this planet; a need to save this planet from ourselves; a need to stop a kind of exponential material growth.

You will all remember the book, "Limits to Growth". You will also remember the discussions which followed. First, we started arguing about the mathematics: some believed the models were wrong, it couldn't be done, you couldn't stop growth — and so on. But we learned from that dialogue and we got into this sort of growth versus no-growth crusade,

with very violent debates. The environmental movement, and the environmental departments which followed, were born of this creative and exhilarating period of conflict.

Now, as we move to new roles and a "more responsible" approach, we must be careful not to forget the origins of the environmental movement. This applies especially to those of us in the bureaucracy who tend to be more cautious and sometimes more mindful of respectability and responsibility than of effectiveness.

Yesterday, many of you saw the film, "If you Love this Planet", which is an emotional appeal to reason. Last year, when it was first released, we showed it to members of the Senior Management Committee, which meets once a month to make decisions concerning the Department. After the showing there was a very long silence, and we moved on to the next item on the agenda with very few words having been spoken. We were caught in this dilemma: that nuclear war is not in our mandate as officials, but it is very much our responsibility as individuals.

The reason why the film was shown last night, and the reason that I refer to it here, is that it asks whether there is an alternative to destruction, whether we can come together to build instead of to destroy? There is a parallel here with the environmental movement today. The initial 'shout of alarm' was necessary, but now, at this point, it's a lot more difficult to propose than to oppose. Yet all of us know that this is what our real responsibility is today. This is what we're either being paid to do or what we are voluntarily trying to do. It is no longer an issue of growth versus no-growth, of environment versus development, nor to my mind has it ever really been.

The First International Conference on the Environment in Stockholm in 1972, was a conference about development. The World Conservation Strategy, to which we all pay lip service, is a strategy about development. The environmental non-government organizations, when they had their annual meeting in May, had as their theme "Towards a Sustainable Development", — sustainable economic recovery. And these are all responses to the challenge to propose solutions.

The word "development" has come to be used in too narrow a sense. A company decides to drill a hole in the middle of Lancaster Sound in disregard of common sense, and it says, "We're trying to develop this country, will you stop us?" We look at smoke stacks belching smoke and we say "That's jobs, that's development." If that's the definition of development, it's got very little in common with what this group is trying to achieve.

That is not what the word "development" means. Life is development. Life is growth and change. Development is

change, change beneficial to the people who have to deal with it. We are seeking alternatives to the destructive aspects of change; alternatives to the smoke stacks and toxics and waste of our society; solutions that will ensure sustainability of life.

In our area, which concerns the natural environment, we have something to contribute to the development of sustainable growth. We have knowledge and expertise, but I think more than that we have a sense of values and a sense of purpose which sustain us more than anything else. I believe very sincerely that there are ways of doing things that are not destructive of the resources on which we all depend.

Sudbury did its share in the past year in the fight against acid rain. There hasn't been much sulphur coming out of Sudbury. But the answer we need is the one that allows the miners of Sudbury to earn their living. It is possible to have a modern, non-polluting industry, and that is the kind we have to look for. We must promote real development that is wise, that is careful, that is sustainable, that is respectful of people. If we achieve that, we will contribute to greater harmony among the people who inhabit this planet. I don't believe we can live in harmony if we don't have much respect for the planet which sustains us.

This is particularly applicable to northern Canada. We have an opportunity, nearly unique for people of the twentieth century, to accomplish there a form of development which is clean and sustainable, and which will permit the inhabitants a greater voice in their future, a greater chance to control their destiny than they have had to date. For me, it is a question of civilization. Will we be civilized enough to permit a development which is different than ours, which respects the realities of that land? Or will we be like most of our ancestors, and steam-roller the minorities who still have difficulty in making their presence felt?

What does all this have to do with councils? Being a member of an advisory council must be almost as difficult as being a deputy minister. David Brooks told you that if you were going to advise the minister you would have to give up advising the public, or something to that effect. You are outside of the system, i.e., you are bureaucratically uninformed. We can beat you at facts. When you ask a question, we always have the answer.

Yet, you are within the system, and have chosen, individually and collectively, to operate within the system. You are caught between the need to push and promote and the need to advise. In this difficult situation, advising in confidence and also having a presence, without which your advice is meaningless, it is essential to be able to take initiatives if your advice is not to be ignored.

In the last few years, CEAC has taken quite a few initiatives.

One of the things which I am sure will be remembered as one of its greatest achievements is getting some of the non-governmental organizations of this country together. This opened a dialogue, created a bridge, so that people in non-governmental organizations could start to feel that they are part of a broad system. CEAC was the vehicle that allowed them to come together periodically, and to achieve a sense of solidarity.

CEAC helped the Department to define its mandate. In 1977, when the Department of Environment was created, the Council was of immense help in providing significant new ideas, such as the one that we are a Department of development.

Council endorsed a report by Don Chant and Ross Hall about toxicology which appeared radical to the bureaucracy but which has been very important in shaping the direction the Department has taken. Today, three years later, we are still completely turning around our approach to the difficult issue of the management of toxic chemicals. It will take a while because what we're trying to do is to change attitudes instead of merely doing highly scientific chemical analysis.

The more recent report on pesticides forced us to confront issues which we were not handling very well; which we still haven't come to grips with.

These initiatives alone, in my view, justify the existence of Council. But you have to keep achieving, and there are three pieces of advice that I would give tonight.

One is to preserve openness and dialogue within the constraints placed upon your work. If you will allow me, I will recall that CEAC had developed an expectation that everything that the bureaucracy did was open and accessible to Council, but that none of the things that Council did were accessible to members of the Department. Now we freely exchange minutes, a symbol of the fact that we have begun to work together. Of course Council advises the Minister, not the Deputy Minister and not the Department. But the greater the openness and dialogue among us, and between councils and the public, the better. Dialogue builds bridges and creates confidence. The benefits that this Department is getting from consultation are immense. You will say it is common sense to provide information to people, to consult with them before we do things that affect them. And I say that we are reaping some early rewards from this policy, and they are giving us confidence that this is the right way to go.

My second piece of advice is to set priorities and go for them. What is it that you really want to achieve as a council? Whom do you want to influence? How do you want to go about it? Select a few key areas, not too many, and be persistent. It is our tendency, because the environment is everywhere, to try to get involved in everything.

My last advice is directed to our colleagues from the provinces. Lean on your provincial departments, but in a constructive way. In Ottawa, when we talk to people, we have a protective cushion of distance. But the provincial ministers and their deputies are close to the issues and events of the “real world”. This is a difficult situation, and they need support and encouragement.

In conclusion, I wish to say that this meeting of Councils is important. We who are in the ministries have acquired a very good feeling of solidarity since we began taking the risks of speaking to people, and not only speaking, but listening. It is our task to listen, and yours to speak. We need your advice, but more than anything else we need your help.

Reports of Working Groups

Role of Councils in Relation to the Public

The guidelines for the working groups suggested several aspects which should be examined including: the extent of public visibility, whether councils should publish reports, the role in relation to non-government organizations, and whether or not councils should hold public hearings.

Group 1 responded to all of the questions posed (Annex F). Their response to the general question of visibility reflects the general tone of their report. The Group felt that the most important role of councils is to provide advice to the minister, with public contact being secondary in nature. Public contact was considered important, but more a by-product of the views provided to the minister. It was thought that a minimum of public contact was essential if a council was to fully perform its duties.

The Group did not reach a consensus on the question of a reactive vis-à-vis a pro-active role, feeling that flexibility was needed in the way each council addressed specific issues.

Reports of studies normally should only be released with ministerial approval, but the Group felt that a council should have the discretionary right to release a report on its own initiative and to accept the consequences.

Councils' role in relation to non-government organizations (NGOs) should be supportive, with the goal of developing direct liaison between NGOs and the government. The Group felt that promoting understanding between interest groups was a by-product of council activities.

The Group felt that councils should help to ensure that public hearings are held when needed, but not through the councils themselves, unless they are specifically mandated to perform this function.

Other activities of a public nature proposed by the Group included: awards for environmental achievements, and contests involving broad groups of people.

In an oral report to the plenary session on this theme, Working Group 3 observed that public opinion is the main ally a minister has, and that it is therefore important for councils to play a public role. The Group felt that a council could fulfill one or more of the following roles: advocacy, i.e., stirring up public opinion; informing and educating the public; informing the Minister of public concerns; and serving as an environmental ombudsman.

Group 3 felt that there was no conflict between a council's role as an adviser to a minister and these public roles, with the possible exception of advocacy. The latter would not create conflict if it were undertaken at the request of a minister.

Relationship of Councils to Government Departments

The guide for the working groups suggested that the following aspects be included in discussions on this theme: the extent of communication between councils and government departments; whether studies should be undertaken at the request of departments; and whether councils should provide advice to officials.

In its report (Annex G) Group 2 felt that the extent of communication would depend on the type of council and its mandate — the mandates of some may include specific requirements in relation to one or more government departments.

Group 1 also submitted a written report (Annex F) on this theme. The Group felt that there should be regular communication between councils and senior departmental officials; that councils should not undertake studies at the request of departments; that councils should provide advice to officials if asked by the minister; and that councils may advise the minister on the performance of sections of the department.

In an oral report to the plenary session, members of Working Group 3 noted that they were all quite dependent on their respective departments. The Group proposed that this aspect be examined in greater depth and a comparison made of how all councils are established and organized.

Role of Councils in relation to the Minister of the Environment

The guide suggested several questions on this theme including: reporting relationship; level of confidentiality; oral or

written communication; advice by Council as a whole or by groups or individuals; whether councils or ministers should set the agendas; and whether councils should undertake critiques of specific government programs.

In the report of Working Group 3 (Annex H), it was noted that the questions in the Guide had been addressed by the Group, but its response was phrased in a more general form. The Group noted the difference in circumstances among the various provinces and territories, and suggested that no one jurisdiction has an ideal model. The Group also emphasized that a council must adapt to evolving circumstances to remain effective.

The Group identified five roles for a council and suggested that a council could undertake any one, or any combination of them. The five roles were: policy advice to a minister on long-term issues; advice on specific environmental issues; serving as a route to the minister for expression of public opinion; communicating problems to the public; and the provision of technical advice to the minister.

The Group also identified the following four basic prerequisites for an effective council: provision of independent advice to the minister; technical soundness of the advice provided; maintainance of priorities; and financial independence at a minimum satisfactory level.

Discussion

The reports of the working groups were discussed by the Assembly in the plenary session. That discussion focussed primarily on the role of councils in relation to ministers, cabinets and the public. The main points raised during that discussion are described in this section.

There was considerable debate on the matter of the ability of councils to serve both their minister and the public at the same time. Some members saw no conflict because the advice given to the minister ultimately reaches the public, i.e., the public is reached indirectly through the minister; the advice is arrived at through an understanding of the environmental concerns of the public; and the public is a minister's ally. It was noted that by discussing priorities, expressing opinions and suggesting courses of action, councils may sometimes place ministers in an awkward position, but in the long term, through the mediation of public opinion, councils support ministers in the implementation of their mandates. It was stated that ministers and the public are on converging courses with respect to reaching long-term goals.

The above discussion led to the observation that circumstances have changed since the days when the public, and particularly non-government organizations, were in conflict with ministers of environment; and that the conflict or "the cutting edge of environmental issues" now rests in

cabinets, i.e., the conflict is between ministers of environment and other ministers. This reflects the fact that environmental issues are now in the mainstream of Canadian politics. There is no conflict now between ministers of environment and non-government organizations on major environmental issues such as acid rain, but there is conflict, lack of understanding, or value differences between ministers of environment and other politicians.

Given the above circumstances, particularly the fact that environmental issues are now in the mainstream of politics, it was suggested that environment councils should re-think their roles. In particular they should consider how they can strengthen their ministers' position in cabinet.

Summary

Dr. P.F.M. McLoughlin, a Vice-Chairman of the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council, had served as chairman for the sessions on The Role of Environmental Councils. At the conclusion of the discussion in plenary session, he presented a summary of the main points which were brought out through the various sessions.

Following the conclusion of the Assembly, Dr. McLoughlin was asked to prepare an expanded summary of the main ideas and directions which emerged during the Workshop. The following is therefore not a formal part of the proceedings, but has been included as a useful reference and reminder to participants.

* * *

One of the clearest themes consistently intruding upon, but at once enriching, the discussions on the role of councils was the basically non-homogenous nature of councils. No two are alike. The group recognized the immense institutional, social, resource availability and other qualitative differences among the various provinces and territories. Within any one council's jurisdiction as well, its dynamics — people, politics, etc. . . . enforce adaptations and changes over time. While agreeing that no one council is the ideal model, the group was also very aware that an advisory group or council must adapt to its evolving circumstances to remain effective. It must keep up with, if not actually anticipate, its own environment. The mutual recognition of this diversity, in turn, generated further levels of inter-council understanding.

There was also a consensus on the basic roles which councils should assume, recognizing that any one council, at any given point of time, would probably not be emphasizing all five:

1. The provision of policy advice to the minister, with an emphasis on longer-term issues and dynamics;

2. Work on specific environmental issues, particularly those specified by the minister, including public hearings;
3. The route to the minister for the expression of public opinion;
4. The presentation of issues to the public, including adequate information to ensure credibility in the decision-making process.
5. The provision of technical advice to the minister. (Councils' composition generally can provide a breadth and depth of skills and experience with respect to an issue beyond the normal mandate of any given government department.)

Resulting from these deliberations was the very real awareness that members of any particular council learned more about themselves as a result of this exchange of views on the role of councils.

The issue of whether or not a council can serve, simultaneously, both the minister and the public was resolved satisfactorily. There is no real contradiction as long as the council does not become an advocate for the public, including specific interest groups; as long as confrontation with the minister is avoided; and as long as the minister's confidence is retained.

These deliberations led to general agreement that what is really needed on councils is a great deal of common sense and world experience. This common sense can be brought to bear collectively, and far more quickly than a group of more specialized technicians in a government department.

Indeed, the core features of an effective council, regardless of its combination of roles, were agreed to be the following:

- (a) The council must give independent advice to the minister. To do this it not only must be free to do so, but also must be seen by the public to be independent.
- (b) A council's recommendations to the minister must be technically sound, regardless of how that soundness is substantiated.
- (c) Councils must address priorities, as reflected in ministerial requirements, public opinion, and any technical parameters.
- (d) Councils must be financially independent at a minimum satisfactory level.

We are entering a new era. Numerous speakers commented on various aspects of the changes underway in our society, noting that we are in a new and dynamic technological system, and are in need of new institutions, new ways of making decisions. We are in need of complete restructuring of some aspects of our society and of our economy. Being an environmentalist under these dynamic circumstances is quite a different thing from being one up until now. These qualitative changes require a great deal of thought as they relate to councils' roles.

Councils, therefore, must be able to influence the decision-makers, particularly by strengthening the influence exerted by their own ministers. If a minister can convince his cabinet colleagues that they will gain or lose public support by the effects of their decisions on environmental quality, then councils are giving ministers the ammunition to move a cabinet or caucus in the right direction. Given the qualitative structural changes already moving our society in new and unknown directions, councils have a heavy responsibility to their ministers, to their province/territory, and to their country.

OTHER BUSINESS

Science Council of Canada Report: "Canada's Threatened Forests"

The Québec Council introduced a recommendation on the above report for consideration by all councils. The recommendation stated:

"In view of the substantial increase in forest exploitation, the provincial Environmental Advisory Councils are surprised that the report 1) ignores all aspects of recovery and recycling of paper; 2) accepts, without criticism, the proposed increase in exploitation of one of our most important resources without undertaking a comprehensive study of the potential harvest sustained in natural ecosystems.

Therefore, the provincial and federal Advisory Councils recommend that the Science Council of Canada make an effort to further integrate the environmental dimension in forest exploitation and explore the avenues of conservation, recovery and recycling of resources."

The recommendation led to a long discussion.

Mr. André Beauchamp, Chairman of the Québec Advisory Council on the Environment, said that his Council's advice to the Assembly was based on extensive studies on forestry which it had conducted during the past few years. The Council had produced a paper, "Politique d'encadrement forestier des lacs et cours d'eau du Québec," (Policies of forest setting surrounding lakes and waterways in Québec) dealing with protection of water resources and the forest ecology. Canadian forests are threatened by irresponsible exploitation. The Québec Council was therefore surprised at the Science Council statement that Canadian forests are threatened by insufficient or inadequate exploitation. This point of view differs substantially from the Québec Council's point of view concerning environmental protection.

- 1) It does not raise the point of equity and justice in the distribution of grants when companies apply for subsidies, complaining that business is bad and the market is saturated.
- 2) The Science Council does not question the ideology that Canada should be a source of raw materials for other countries.
- 3) The Science Council does not question the ideology of limitless exploitation of resources.
- 4) It does not propose any economic measures for checking waste.

- 5) The Science Council does not advocate any measures for recovering and recycling paper, an area in which Québec has been active.

The Québec Council's recommendation to the Assembly had been based on these considerations.

He alluded to a Québec report by the Bureau d'audiences (Office of Public Hearings), which judged the pesticide spraying of the spruce moth has been of doubtful effectiveness from the technical and economic points of view, and dangerous from the ecological standpoint.

Some support for the recommendation was given by New Brunswick because it was a way of calling attention to the problems. It was noted that about ten years ago, the St. John River Basin Board anticipated a future increase in the use of not only insecticides, but also herbicides, soil conditioners and fertilizers. The New Brunswick Council at that time made a recommendation that environmental impact appraisal and pilot projects be undertaken and carefully monitored. This recommendation was not followed. This year, in New Brunswick, 70,000 hectares are being treated by airborne herbicides.

Mr. Beauchamp agreed that the Science Council report makes no direct mention of pesticide spraying and calls for research in this area only in general terms. It only briefly refers to basic research in biotechnology, genetic engineering, silvicultural genetics, vegetable physiology, behaviour of ecosystems and soil chemistry.

It was noted that the report by the Science Council was not solicited by the Department of Environment. Recommendation of the Science Council to involve more federal funds in forest activities was deemed very appropriate. The forestry industry produces products worth 23 billion dollars annually, exports 12 billion dollars worth, and provides one million jobs. For a long time Canada has been mining its forests for specific purposes, and there has been degradation of the forests, even though this is a renewable resource which could be properly managed. The forests are also the habitat of wildlife, the watershed for water systems, and the basis of ecosystems that generate most of our resource base. It was pointed out that responsibility for forests is vested in the provinces. The federal government has done some research, although it is an insignificant amount in relation to the value of the resource. Integration of the Canadian Forestry Service within DOE was a positive step, ensuring that the environmental point of view would be reflected in its activities.

Some conclusions of a report published four years ago by the Environment Council of Alberta, following major public hearings were outlined. The forestry service and forest companies of Alberta were doing an excellent job environmentally. The major threat to Alberta forests came from the oil and gas industry, which under less rigid restrictions cut three acres of timber to every four cut by the forest industry. As a result of the report, changes have since been made. It would be beneficial to increase the present rate of cutting by more than forty percent. This rate could be doubled without danger to Alberta's forests. However, this might not apply to other provinces.

Mention was made of the 700 million dollar technology program announced in May 1983, of which 22 million is earmarked for biotechnology. It is alarming that this allocation does not take into consideration forests and/or the environment. The application of biotechnological aspects to the problems of forest management, wildlife habitat, etc., will be ignored unless included in overall planning. It was pointed out that CEAC had raised this subject with the Minister during the past year. Advanced genetic engineering and silviculture could increase the potential for yield and sustainable harvesting of lumber. Canada sorely lags in genetic engineering for second crops. Every year, the loss from fires, forest pests and disease amounts to three times the amount harvested. A large potential exists for improved performance.

Mr. Beauchamp stated that the Science Council of Canada has much influence over political decisions. In this report it has completely overlooked the environment, because it has not raised the question of whether or not production should be increased, nor whether waste can be reduced. He felt that two questions should be asked: Why was the possibility of recovering and recycling paper not addressed? and, must we ratify a philosophy of unlimited growth, unilaterally or collectively? The "Limits to Growth" debate took place twelve years ago, and the Science Council is still ignoring it completely. Mr. Beauchamp said that the Science Council is the highest scientific authority in Canada. It is doing a good job, and is well liked and supported. It should be asked to show environmental awareness in the future.

The reaction of other members was mixed but generally supportive of the idea that the Science Council should be asked to give more emphasis to environmental issues. It was noted that there were contrasting situations among the various jurisdictions ranging from over-utilization to under-utilization of forests.

There was a lengthy debate on the precise action which should be taken in regard to the recommendation presented by the Québec Council.

The Chairman of the Assembly, Mr. Beck, said that each council should consider action on the Science Council report as

it sees fit, in the context of its particular jurisdiction. Councils seemed to be agreed on the need to point out to the Science Council that its good record of environmental awareness had not been maintained.

The question was raised as to whether each council should write to the Science Council, or whether concerns would be expressed via a resolution of the Assembly. There was some support for joint action by all councils. Mr. Beauchamp felt that common action would have more weight than separate council actions. If this created a problem, he would withdraw his suggestion because it was not a serious concern.

Mr. Beck clarified past practices, which are still maintained. The practice adopted, out of respect for individual jurisdictions and their particular circumstances, has been to go forward with recommendations for action by individual councils. Each council was therefore being requested to put forward to the Science Council this concern in its own terms.

Publication of the Proceedings

The Assembly Chairman, Mr. Beck, told the Assembly that CEAC, as host council, had undertaken to publish the proceedings on a timely basis. CEAC would attempt to collate the material and have it made available by September. Mr. Beck asked participants to submit material they felt should be included in the proceedings as soon as possible. Notes from the workshops and council reports should be provided.

It was suggested that the detailed notes taken in Workshop 2 be reproduced and distributed, as many of the points made could not be summarized. It was agreed that they would be incorporated or appended.

Mr. Beck asked Dr. Maniar if the consultant's report on the Manitoba Council would be available to the public. Dr. Maniar advised that it had to go to the Minister for approval before public release. Mr. Beck asked that it then be sent to each of the participants in the Assembly. It was also requested that Saskatchewan circulate copies of its study.

There was some uncertainty whether or not the proceedings should include copies of the workshop sessions. It was felt that they should at least be circulated as background information. Proceedings should be kept short, to ensure they would be read.

Plans for the 1984 Assembly

The Chairman brought up the question of holding a IXth Assembly. Should it be held? If so, where? Did such assemblies have value?

Mr. André Beauchamp (Québec) said that he was very happy to have participated in the meeting; that he had found it useful; and that he was pleased with the welcome he had received. He wished that he had been authorized to invite the councils to Québec in 1984. He hoped to persuade the Québec Ministers of the Environment and Intergovernmental Affairs to extend an invitation in the future but he could not make a commitment because, as a result of constitutional reform, Québec had become reticent about participation in pan-Canadian conferences. He hoped there would be another assembly, and that he could participate. He thought it had been a very constructive and beneficial exercise, working together and learning how, with differing mandates, the councils pursued their common objectives.

Dr. A.C. Maniar (Manitoba) said that after observing the proceedings of the Manitoba Council for four years, he felt very strongly that it had gained from the sharing of experience by the provinces. It was advantageous to meet once a year to share experiences, strategies, and approaches, and to learn what is happening across Canada. He highly recommended once-a-year meetings.

Mr. Alistair Crerar (Alberta) congratulated CEAC on the benefits of the Assemblies. He believed that the present Assembly came closest to giving the councils a better understanding of the problems faced by other councils. The theme had been really provocative. He congratulated CEAC on the focus, arrangements and organization of the meeting. He thought it might be useful next time to pick up where the councils left

off at this meeting, with the question, "What is the leading edge in the environmental movement, and what is the role of councils within it? What are the different kinds of support that can be given to ministers?" He endorsed Alberta's participation next year.

Mr. M. Haugg (Nova Scotia) agreed with Mr. Crerar, and expressed himself in favour of continuing the meetings. He felt that registration fees would remove a financial burden on host councils. It was agreed that the decision would be up to the next hosting council.

Mr. W.B. Drowley (Ontario) felt that councils should continue to meet, as they had a specific role to play.

Mr. J. Donihee (NWT) appreciated the opportunity to be present. He had found it interesting to see how information was gathered and transmitted to ministers. He would discuss this with his Minister and Deputy Minister. The Territories were trying to form a hunters' and trappers' group to gather and deliver information to the minister. It could be expanded to incorporate some of the ideas discussed at this meeting. Pressures of development were strong in the North, and officials were caught in the crush of day-to-day issues. A council could provide considered and objective advice.

The Chairman, Mr. Beck, said that by late November or early December, CEAC would contact each council about interest in holding a IXth Assembly.

ANNEX A

VIIIth Assembly of Councils
June 6-7, 1983

PROGRAM VIIIth ASSEMBLY ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCILS OF CANADA

June 5-6-7, 1983
Place Vincent Massey
Hull, Quebec

SUNDAY, JUNE 5

- | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 19:00 | - <i>FILMS</i> : "Requiem or Recovery" (20 min.)
"Flyway North" (10 min.)
"Wolf Pack" (20 min.) | - Carleton Room
Skyline Hotel
Ottawa |
| 20:00 to
24:00 | - <i>REGISTRATION AND RECEPTION</i>
(Informal — Spouses welcome) | - Carleton Room
Skyline Hotel
Ottawa |

MONDAY, JUNE 6

- | | | |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9:00 | - <i>WELCOME</i>
- Mr. Tom Beck, Chairman, CEAC
and Dr. Robert Bergeron, Vice-Chairman | - St. Laurent Room
11th Floor
Place Vincent
Massey (PVM) |
| 9:15 | - <i>"THE PUBLIC ROLE IN SETTING AND ENFORCING
ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS"</i>
- Presentation by
Mr. Alistair D. Crerar, Chief
Executive Officer, Environment
Council of Alberta, and
Prof. A.R. Lucas
- Discussion and recommendations | |
| 10:45 | - <i>REFRESHMENTS</i> | |
| 11:00 | - <i>REPORTS BY COUNCILS</i> (Dr. P. Meincke) | |
| 12:30 | - <i>LUNCHEON</i> , hosted by CEAC.
Speaker: Dr. David Brooks, of
MARBEK Resource Consultants Ltd.
Theme: "Public Point of View on
the Role of Environmental Advisory Councils" | - Restaurant Philemon
Main Floor, PVM |

- | | | |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| 14:00 | - <i>ROLE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCILS</i>

- Presentation by Dr. A.C. Maniar,
Chairman, Manitoba Environmental
Council | - St. Laurent Room
PVM |
| 14:30 | - <i>WORKING GROUPS ON ROLE OF COUNCILS</i>
(Refreshments available) | - Rooms to be
designated on
11th Floor, PVM |
| 17:30 | - <i>AFTERNOON SESSION CONCLUDES</i> | |
| 19:30 | - <i>DINNER</i> , hosted by CEAC.
Speaker: Mr. Jacques G  rin, Deputy
Minister, Environment Canada
Theme: "Living in Harmony with our
Planet". | - Victoria Room
Skyline Hotel |

TUESDAY, JUNE 7

- | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 9:00 | - <i>WORKING GROUPS ON ROLE OF COUNCILS</i>
(cont.) | - Rooms to be
designated on
11th Floor, PVM |
| 10:30 | - <i>REFRESHMENTS</i> | |
| 11:00 | - <i>WORKING GROUPS ON ROLE OF COUNCILS</i>
(cont.) | |
| 12:30 | - <i>LUNCHEON</i> , hosted by the Federal
Minister of the Environment.
Speaker: The Hon. John Roberts.
Theme: "A Cabinet Minister's View
of Environmental Advisory Councils." | - Room 606,
South Block,
Parliament
Buildings,
(180 Wellington St.
Ottawa) |
| 14:00 | - <i>PLENARY SESSION</i> (Dr P. McLoughlin)

- Reports and Recommendations of
Working Groups

- Discussion

- Plans for Publication of the
Proceedings | - St. Laurent Room
PVM |
| 15:30 | - <i>REFRESHMENTS</i> | |
| 16:00 | - <i>PLENARY SESSION</i> (cont.)

- Plans for the 9th Assembly

- Other Business | |
| 17:00 | - <i>ADJOURNMENT</i> | |

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

VIIIth Assembly
Environment Councils of Canada

Dates: June 5 - 7:00 p.m., films
 - 8:00 p.m., registration and reception
June 6 - 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., business session
 - 7:30 p.m., dinner
June 7 - 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., business session

Location: Events will take place in three locations:

- *Skyline Hotel:* located in downtown Ottawa, at 101 Lyon Street between Albert and Queen Streets. Accommodation has been reserved at this hotel. The film showing, registration and reception on June 5 will be held in the Carleton Room (CL — Convention Level) of the hotel, and the dinner on June 6 in the Victoria Room on the same level (CL).
- *Place Vincent Massey (PVM):* a large office building containing offices of Environment Canada at 351 St. Joseph Boulevard in Hull. The business sessions will be held in the St. Laurent Room on the 11th floor. Translation facilities are incorporated in this room. Working groups will meet in other rooms on the 11th floor. The luncheon on June 6 will be held in a dining room at the back of the Restaurant Philemon on the main floor of PVM.
- *South Block, Parliament Buildings (180 Wellington Street, Ottawa):* The Hon. John Roberts, federal Minister of the Environment, will host a luncheon on June 7 in Room 606 of the South Block.

Note: A map on which the above locations were marked was mailed earlier.

Accommodation: Rooms have been reserved at the Skyline Hotel. The rates are \$54.00 single and \$64.00 double. Confirmation will be required by May 15.

Activities for spouses: Spouses of delegates may participate in any of the activities, including attending business sessions as observers, if they wish. They are specifically invited to attend the June 5 film showing and reception, and the dinner on June 6. No special entertainment has been arranged in advance. Any spouses interested in special activities should enquire at the registration desk at 8 p.m., June 5.

Transportation Notes:

1. "Airporter" bus service is available from the airport to the Skyline Hotel.
2. For those who drive to Ottawa, underground parking is available at the Skyline Hotel. Parking rates for registered guests are \$4.75-\$5.25 per day.

Parking can also be arranged at PVM but requests for temporary parking permits for this location must be made in advance.
3. Charter bus service will be provided between the Skyline Hotel and Place Vincent Massey. The bus will leave the Skyline Hotel at 8:30 a.m. on both mornings. Departure times from PVM will be announced at the meeting. Transportation by charter bus will also be provided between PVM and the South Block for the luncheon on June 7.
4. For those who, for any reason, cannot make use of the charter bus between the Skyline Hotel and PVM, there are two alternatives:

- The taxi fare is \$6.00-\$7.00 one way.
- Hull buses (Outaouais — blue coloured) run between Wellington Street, one block north of the Skyline Hotel, and PVM every 15 minutes. En route to Hull the route numbers are 23, 33 and 60. Route numbers for the return are 13, 31, 33 and 60. Cash bus fare is 85¢.

PROGRAM

Films: Films listed will be shown during the 7:00 — 8:00 p.m. period.

Registration and Reception: The reception will provide an opportunity for delegates to get together and exchange information and views in an informal setting.

The Public Role in Setting and Enforcing Environmental Standards: A copy of the report prepared for the Environmental Council of Alberta by A.R. Lucas, M.A.H. Franson and R.T. Franson has been forwarded to each Council by the Environmental Council of Alberta. Delegates should study the report in advance so that they are prepared for a discussion following the presentation and for consideration of any pertinent recommendations.

Reports by Councils: Each environment Council will be asked to give a brief report on its activities, with particular reference to its role. Typed reports of approximately 2 pages in length should be tabled and will subsequently appear in the Proceedings. Following the reports by councils, representatives of jurisdictions which do not have councils in operation at the present time will have an opportunity to give brief/oral presentations.

Luncheon Speaker (Monday): Dr. David Brooks is the former Director of the Office of Energy Conservation with Energy, Mines and Resources, and has been active with Friends of the Earth for several years. He will open the session on "Role of Environment Councils" with a talk from the public perspective.

Presentation by Manitoba: This presentation from a provincial council perspective will help set the stage for discussion by all delegates.

Working Groups: Three working groups are planned. As noted, groups will meet in rooms to be assigned on the 11th floor, adjacent to the St. Laurent Room. Guidelines will be prepared for the groups, and chairmen appointed in advance. The objective of the working groups will be to identify a range of activities, any combination of which could constitute the role of an environment council. The words "any combination" should be stressed because the exact role of any council will depend on circumstances of the time and jurisdiction. The objective is not to describe a standard role for councils, but rather to identify and weigh a range of possibilities.

Dinner (Monday): The speaker will be the Deputy Minister of Environment Canada, Mr. Jacques Gérin. Mr. Gérin will touch on department-advisory council relationships, but the broad theme as noted in the Program will be: "Living in Harmony with our Planet".

Working Groups (cont.): It is proposed that the working groups spend at least part of Tuesday morning putting into draft form an outline of one aspect ("Subject Area" - see Guide for Working Groups) of a possible role for councils.

Luncheon (Tuesday): The Hon. John Roberts will comment on the role of councils from the perspective of a cabinet minister. This will be the final presentation prior to discussion in the plenary session.

Plenary Session

Reports of the Working Groups: The reports to the plenary session should include the draft outlines and any recommendations prepared in the morning session.

Discussion: Open discussion on the above reports and adoption of recommendations. Delegates may wish to adopt as a guideline or guidelines, a composite outline of the areas of possible activity for environment councils.

Plans for the 9th Assembly: Delegates should agree on the location for the 1984 Assembly, and consider possible themes.

Other Business: Any other matters related to Assembly business, including recommendations on subjects other than that discussed by the “working groups”.

VIIIth Assembly of Councils
June 6-7, 1983

Revised June 6, 1983

Attendance at VIIIth Assembly of Councils

C.E.A.C.

1. T. Beck
2. R. Bergeron
3. P. McLoughlin
4. S. Holtz
5. M. Hummel
6. T. Jeanes
7. L. Lepage
8. A. Lucas
9. D. McRorie
10. N. MacPherson

Alberta

11. A. Crerar
12. B. Flook
13. D. Buchwald

Saskatchewan

14. H. Maliepaard

Manitoba

15. A. Maniar

Ontario

16. W. Drowley

Québec

17. A. Beauchamp
18. R. Brosseau
19. B. Gauthier

New Brunswick

20. D. Smith
21. J. Henderson

Nova Scotia

22. J. MacDonald
23. M. Haugg
24. M. Carmichael
25. D. McCready

NWT

26. J. Donihee
27. J. Harrison

Assembly Secretariat

28. M. McConnell
29. E. Roots
30. V. Halliwell
31. M. Doneit
32. N. Emond

MAILING LIST FOR INVITATIONS TO 1983 ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILS

Revised May 31, 1983

CANADA

(See list attached)

BRITISH COLUMBIA

(No advisory council)

Mr. B.E. Marr
Deputy Minister
Department of Environment
Parliament Buildings
Victoria, B.C.
V8V 1X5
(604) 387-5755

ALBERTA

Mr. Alistair D. Crerar
Chairman
Environmental Council of Alberta
8th Floor, Weber Centre
5555 Calgary Trail
Edmonton, Alberta
T6H 5P9
(403) 427-5792

SASKATCHEWAN

(Council appointments pending)

Mr. Hugo S. Maliepaard
Director, Policy, Planning
and Research Branch
Department of the Environment
1855 Victoria Avenue
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 3V5
(306) 565-6111

MANITOBA

Dr A.C. Maniar
68 Viola Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R2V 3B9
(204) 944-0270 or 334-4502

ONTARIO

(No advisory council)

Mr. W.B. Drowley
Senior Advisor to Minister
Ministry of the Environment
135 St. Clair Avenue West
Toronto (Ontario)
M4V 1P5
(416) 965-1955

QUEBEC

M. André Beauchamp
Chairman
Conseil consultatif de l'environnement
1020, rue St-Augustin
Québec (Québec)
G1R 5J1
(418) 643-3818

NEW BRUNSWICK

(Council appointments pending)

Mr. B.B. Barnes
Deputy Minister
Department of Environment
P.O. Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1
(506) 453-2932

NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. James MacDonald
Chairman
Nova Scotia Environmental Control Council
Box 279
Amherst, Nova Scotia
B4H 3Z2
(902) 667-7214

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

(No advisory council)

Mr. A. Lavoie
Department of Community and
Cultural Affairs
P.O. Box 2000
Charlottetown, P.E.I.
C1A 7N8
(902) 892-3561

NEWFOUNDLAND

(No advisory council)

Mr. W.A. Kinsman
Deputy Minister
Department of the Environment
P.O. Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7
(709) 737-2572

YUKON TERRITORY

(No advisory council)

Mr. G. Livingston
Deputy Minister
Department of Renewable Resources
P.O. Box 2703
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2C6
(403) 667-5460

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

(No advisory council)

Mr. H.J. Monaghan
Assistant Deputy Minister
Department of Renewable Resources
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2L9
(403) 873-7420

CEAC**CHAIRMAN**

Mr. T. Beck
422-33rd Avenue N.W.
Calgary, Alberta
T2K 0B4
Home : (403) 277-1363

VICE-CHAIRMEN

Dr. R. Bergeron
1478 Les Eboulements
Chicoutimi, Québec
G7H 4L8
Office: (418) 545-5781
Home : (418) 549-7567

Dr. P.F.M. McLoughlin
President
Peter McLoughlin Associates Ltd.
Consulting Development Economists
P.O. Box 1288
Comox, B.C. V8N 3Z0
Office: (604) 682-4096
Home : (604) 339-3461

MEMBERS

Ms. S. Holtz
4 Umlah's Road
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3P 2G6
Office: (902) 422-3281
Home : (902) 477-3690

Mr. M. Hummel
Executive Director
World Wildlife Fund (Canada)
60 St. Clair Avenue East, Suite 201
Toronto, Ontario
M4T 1N5
Office: (416) 923-8173

Mr. T.G. Jeanes
Vice-President, Woodlands
Balco Industries Ltd., R.R. #3
Kamloops, B.C.
V2C 5K1
Office: (604) 578-7212
Home : (604) 376-5113

Madame L.B. Lepage
93, Avenue De Courcellette
Outremont (Quebec)
H2V 3A5
Office: (514) 374-4700/387-7292
Home : (514) 271-6666

Professor A.R. Lucas
Faculty of Law
University of Calgary
2920-24th Avenue, N.W.
Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4
Office: (403) 284-1590
Home : (403) 284-2737

Ms. N. MacPherson
Council for Yukon Indians
707 Cook Street
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2T4
Office: (403) 667-7631, ext. 49
Home : (403) 667-6019

Mr. H.D. McRorie
Director, Agricultural Services
The Royal Bank of Canada
220 Portage Avenue, P.O. Box 923
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 2T5
Office: (204) 988-4071
Home : (204) 837-4913

Dr. P. Meincke
President
University of Prince Edward Island
Charlottetown, P.E.I.
C1A 4P3
Office: (902) 892-4391

SECRETARIAT (Department of Environment, 25th Floor, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Hull, K1A 0H3,
Tele: (819) 997-2395)

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Mr. M. McConnell
Home: (613) 256-3766

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

Mrs. V. Halliwell
Home: (613) 523-1044

SCIENCE ADVISOR

Dr. E.F. Roots
Home: (819) 827-1602
Work: (819) 997-2393

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION BY INDIVIDUAL COUNCILS

The Public Role in Setting and Enforcing Environmental Standards

Recommendation No. 1

'The joint Advisory Councils request that the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council undertake an investigation and review of alternatives to existing methods of regulating and enforcing environmental standards.

Explanation:

The Economic Council of Canada has recommended the use of economic rewards and penalties as alternatives or supplements to environmental regulation.

Professor Lucas has pointed out the weaknesses of the existing Criminal Law Model as the basis for all existing environmental regulation. Legal alternatives, such as contract law, should be investigated for their strengths and weaknesses and applicability to regulation and enforcement of environmental standards in Canada.

Because of the universal nature of legal and economic alternatives to existing regulatory processes it would be appropriate for the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council to support such a recommendation."

Recommendation No. 2

"That each council review ways and means for public input in the process of establishing and reviewing environmental standards. Standards include maximum contaminant levels in ambient air and water as well as maximum levels for contaminant emissions into air and water.

Explanation:

The process of establishing environmental standards is not solely a scientific or technical matter. Significant value judgments are involved as to what objectives to pursue and generally what degree of risk to accept.

Public consultation can provide important input on this basic question of acceptable degree of risk. It can also reinforce accountability in environment officials responsible for standard-setting.

Public involvement in standard-setting is a two-way process in that it can help to educate and inform the public on the difficulties and complexities of standard-setting and enforcement of standards. Apparent public suspicion about the adequacy of standards and about apparent lack of vigour in enforcement, may be reduced."

Report by the Science Council: "Canada's Threatened Forests"

Recommendation No. 3

"In its statement "Canada's Threatened Forests", the Science Council of Canada recommends greater government participation in the area of Research and Development (\$650 million per year for reforestation and silvicultural treatment, and \$500 million for forest protection by 1987).

In view of the substantial increase in forest exploitation, the provincial Environmental Advisory Councils are surprised that the report:

- ignores all aspects of recovery and recycling of paper;
- accepts, without criticism, the proposed increase in exploitation of one of our most important resources without undertaking a comprehensive study of the potential harvest sustained in natural ecosystems.

Therefore, the provincial and federal Advisory Councils recommend that the Science Council of Canada make an effort to further integrate the environmental dimension in forest exploitation and explore the avenues of conservation, recovery and recycling of resources.”

WORKING GROUPS
VIIIth ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILS
JUNE 6-7, 1983 — OTTAWA

GROUP #1

LOCATION:

St. Laurent Room
11th Floor

TOPIC: Role and
Relationship to the
Public

CHAIRMAN: A. CRERAR

R. Bergeron
B. Gauthier
J. Harrison
L. Lepage
M. Hummel
G. Livingston
N. MacPherson
D. McCready
D. McRorie
F. Roots

GROUP #2

LOCATION:

Mackenzie Room
11th Floor

TOPIC: Relationship to
Government Departments

CHAIRMAN: M. HAUGG

T. Beck
R. Brosseau
D. Buchwald
M. Doneit
V. Halliwell
S. Holtz
A. Lucas
H. Maliepaard
J. Donihee
D. Smith
J. MacDonald

GROUP #3

LOCATION:

Saguenay Room
11th Floor

TOPIC: Relationship to
Ministers

CHAIRMAN: J. HENDERSON

M. Carmichael
W. Drowley
B. Flook
A. Beauchamp
T. Jeanes
A. Maniar
M. McConnell
P. McLoughlin

ANNEX E

VIIIth Assembly of Councils
June 6-7, 1983

Guide for Working Groups (1983 Assembly of Environmental Councils of Canada)

Subject: Future Role of Environment Councils

Objective: The tentative objective (subject to confirmation by delegates to the 1983 Assembly) is to describe a range of activities, any combination of which could constitute the future role of an environmental advisory council. This recognizes that the role of any particular council should reflect the circumstances of the time, and of that particular jurisdiction.

- General Guidelines:**
1. Three discussion groups will be formed. A chairman has been named for each group. Each group should select a "recording secretary" to prepare the group's report to the plenary session in the afternoon of June 7. (Members of CEAC will be prepared to serve as recording secretaries, but the final choice will be up to each group.)
 2. A framework of suggested subject areas is described in this paper. Each group should first address Subject Area A, and then discuss in detail its priority area: Group 1 should address in detail Subject Area B; Group 2 should address Subject Area C; and Group 3, Subject Area D.
 3. A written report of each group's recommendations or suggestions on Subject Area A and on its priority Subject Area (B, C or D) must be handed in to the Assembly secretariat no later than 10:00 a.m. on June 7. Copies of these reports will be distributed to all delegates and will provide a framework for discussion during the plenary session.
 4. After each group is satisfied that it has dealt in sufficient depth with Subject Area A and its priority Subject Area, it can then proceed to discussion of the other subject areas, e.g., after Group 1 has discussed in depth, and agreed on a report covering Subject Areas A and B, it should go on to a discussion of Subject Areas C and D. The report on these Subject Areas need not be provided in writing in advance of the plenary session, but must be provided in written form to the Assembly secretariat prior to the end of the Plenary Session.
 5. Discussion need not be limited to the questions suggested under each Subject Area, nor need all questions be addressed. The notes are provided as a suggested framework. Additions and/or deletions can be made by each group.
 6. All reports should include the pros and cons concerning a particular proposal or recommendation, not just a simple statement of the recommendation. The reports can identify a range of views, or alternative proposals.

Subject Area A (All discussion groups)

General Questions

- Clarify the sense in which you use the word "environment" as in "environment" or "environmental" council: in the specific sense of pollution control or prevention, in the all-embracing sense of the natural environment which encompasses activities frequently classified as "renewable resource management", or in some intermediate sense.

- Draft a statement of objective(s) for a council. (You may want to check back against your statement periodically to ensure that your recommendations are in keeping with your stated objective(s) and vice versa.)
- Describe the characteristics of topics or issues with which councils should be concerned, e.g. specialized vis-à-vis interdisciplinary; technical vs. policy; localized vs. jurisdiction-wide; immediate vs. long-term.
- Are there, by the fundamental nature of councils, characteristics which set them apart from government departments and other groups and organizations and therefore should affect their choice of subject matter?
- What is the relationship between the funding process which supports a council and the nature of a Council's activity and effectiveness?
- Describe the relationship which should exist among individual councils, and describe the values and benefits.

Subject Area B (Priority subject area for Group 1)

“Role of Councils in Relation to the Public”

- Should councils have any public visibility — any planned direct contact with the public?
- Should that contact be of a minimal, reactive nature, or a pro-active, advocacy, educational nature?
- Should all, or just selected council reports and statements be released to the public, or released only with the approval of the Minister?
- What should a council's role be in relation to non-government organizations? Should it support and/or maintain close working relationships with environmental groups? What about other non-government groups — industry associations, etc.? Should councils try to build understanding between different interest groups?
- Should councils undertake public hearings, enquiries or investigations?
- Other activities of a public nature?

Subject Area C (Priority subject area for Group 2)

“The Relationship of Councils to Government Departments”

Note: While the relationship with “environment” departments may be of primary concern, councils may find that they have some form of relationship with two or more departments, depending on the division of responsibilities within a given jurisdiction.

- Should there be regular communication between a council and senior departmental officials? Should the council maintain an “arm's length” relationship with the department(s)?
- Should councils undertake studies at the request or direction of departmental officials?
- Should councils provide advice and recommendations to officials?
- Define or give examples of the ideal relationship between councils and government departments, and the form and extent of communication.

Subject Area D (Priority topic for Group 3)

“Role of Councils in Relation to the Minister of the Environment”

- Should councils report directly to the Minister, to more than one minister, to Cabinet, to Parliament/Legislature, or have some other reporting arrangement?

- Should the relationship be of a confidential nature, i.e., with bureaucrats and/or the public not being aware of the substance of the reporting?
- Should communication be in writing, orally or a combination?
- To what extent should advice be provided by a) council as a whole; b) groups or committees of council; or c) individual members?
- How should the topics for advice be selected: a) by the Minister/Cabinet; b) by council?
- Should councils undertake for the Minister/Cabinet reviews or critiques of specific government programs?

REPORT BY WORKING GROUP #1

Subject Area B — Role of Councils in Relation to the Public.

Chaired by: Mr. A. Crerar

Public Visibility — Planned Contact with the Public

Group 1 felt that the most important role of council is to provide advice to the minister, with public contact secondary in nature. The question of public visibility would be determined in large part by the amount of time left over after meeting the requirements for ministerial advice. Public contact and visibility is important, however, but perhaps more as a by-product of the views prepared and transmitted to the minister. There was a significant viewpoint that the matter of public supportability would be determined to some extent by the nature of the council, with understanding that a minimum of public contact is essential for the council to fully perform its duties.

Contact of a minimal, reactive or pro-active nature?

No consensus appeared on this point other than that sufficient flexibility was needed by each council to address specific issues as required. In some instances, this would take the role of providing a public forum or ensuring that such a forum is held — in others, that of serving in a pro-active educational way. There is a need for councils to give a hearing to specific public views, accommodating these needs as required by way of hearings, educational support, etc. All degrees of public opinion must be heard, in one form or another, allowing the council to determine the overall flavor of each issue. This role may also involve a secondary step of how to advise the minister to react to a specific issue or how the public may react to an issue. Council must develop the needed skills to interface with the public as appropriate in each instance. In fact, councils must be at times reactive, pro-active and educational and to a lesser extent, serve in an advocacy role on selected issues when council can muster the necessary level of support internally.

Council Reports — Released with Ministerial Approval?

Normally, reports should only be released with ministerial approval. At the same time, however, some discretionary freedom is needed in the event that the minister does not act on the report for one reason or another. Normally, this flexibility is obtained by having discretionary rights to issue a report within a given time period unless otherwise instructed by the minister. In these isolated instances, council would have to reconsider their position and either revise the report or move independently of the minister's wishes, accepting the consequences of such action.

Council's Role re Non-Government Organizations? (NGOs)

Council should have a good open relationship so that NGOs can contribute through the council. Perhaps the best relationship would be one of encouraging departmental members to liaise directly with the NGO's on specific issues. Again, councils can facilitate operations of NGO's through providing a supportive role at appropriate times, but always with the ultimate goal of having the NGO's liaise directly with governments. This process would then enable councils to add their own comments on the views offered by the NGOs — in a sense, free of any obligation to the NGOs. Councils must be able to seek out relevant input re specific issues and often this may involve liaison with NGOs for council's internal requirements.

With respect to promoting understanding between interest groups, members felt that while this is a by-product of council activities, it is not necessarily a prime objective. In many instances, council activities do in fact, promote a better level of understanding between interest groups, in the ongoing course of carrying out council activities.

Should Councils Undertake Public Hearings, Enquiries or Investigations?

Groups felt that councils should help to ensure that public hearings are held when needed, but not through the council itself. The exception to this would be those instances where councils are mandated specifically to undertake public hearings. Enquiries and investigations would not normally be carried out by councils, however, it would be difficult to ignore a ministerial request. One option would be for the council to formulate alternative proposals to seek out the facts rather than carry out the investigation itself.

Other Activities of a Public Nature:

Some suggested activities were:

- 1) Awards for specific achievements in the environmental field.
- 2) Contests to involve broad groups of people.
- 3) Choice of members who are active publically, thus providing new opportunities for the council to interact with the public on an individual basis.

Subject Area C — Relationship of Councils to Government:

There should be regular communication between councils and senior departmental officials. This contact can be either of an official or an unofficial nature. The point was raised that councils can often provide communication bridges between departments at the provincial level and between provincial/federal officials.

Councils should not undertake studies at the request or direction of departments.

If asked by the minister, councils could and should provide advice and recommendations to the departmental officials. In the normal process of communications with departmental officials, however, advice and recommendations will form part of these communications.

Councils may, at times, pass judgments to the minister with respect to performance or lack of performance on behalf of given sections of the department.

REPORT BY WORKING GROUP #2

Subject Area C — Relationship of Councils to Government Departments.

Chaired by: Mr. M. Haugg

Delegates were somewhat ambivalent that this question was chosen:

1. Should there be regular communication between council and senior departmental officials?

It was felt that the extent of communication depends on the type of council and its mandate. Some councils have specific mandates with different departments. Some work closer to the minister, whereas others operate independently. If a council has a broader mandate, by definition it has to deal with, and provide advice to other departments. That liaison should be initiated by the council, as opposed to the department. One way in which effectiveness could be improved is the setting up of a "permanent" secretariat (e.g., one person on staff, full-time) by those councils that now do not have full-time staff.

Subject Area A — General Questions

- word "environment" was used in a broader sense by all councils;
- points of a fundamental nature or characteristics which set councils apart from other groups or organizations (not in order of importance);
- the representative nature of councils: representative of the views, values, etc., of the general public (mirror-image of the public);
- Council provides a filtering or tempering of individual views. "Collective" advice is developed through discussion and argument;
- The independence from government was recognized as valuable characteristic and one that can be endangered by a permanent secretariat, although the latter, when present within a council, appears to add to its scope of activity and its effectiveness.

Advice

The advice should be to the minister except where a council, by its mandate, is directed otherwise.

REPORT BY WORKING GROUP #3

Subject Area D — Role of Councils in Relation to the Minister of Environment

Chaired by: Dr. J. Henderson

Introduction

The specific questions posited in the “Guide” have been addressed. The discussion group’s reactions to these questions are implicit in the findings below, and the specific questions themselves are not addressed here.

Basic Premise

The group recognizes the immense institutional, social, resource availability and other qualitative differences among Provinces and Territories. Within any one jurisdiction as well, its dynamics — people, politics, etc., — enforce adaptations and changes over time. While agreeing that no one jurisdiction has the ideal model, the group also recognizes that an advisory group or council must adapt to its evolving circumstances to remain effective.

Roles for Councils/Advisory Groups

The discussion group agreed that any given council could assume, at any one time, any one or a combination of the following roles:

1. The providing of policy advice to the minister, with an emphasis on longer-term issues and dynamics;
2. Work on specific environmental issues, particularly those specified by the minister, including public hearings;
3. The providing of a route to the minister for the expression of public opinion;
4. The taking of problems to the public, including information and, as appropriate, the improvement of departmental credibility with the public;
5. The providing of technical advice to the minister. Council’s composition generally can provide a breadth and depth of skills and experience with respect to an issue beyond the normal mandate of any given government department.

Basic Prerequisites of an Effective Council/Advisory Group

The following four elements are core features of an effective council, regardless of its combination of roles.

- a) The council must give independent advice to the minister; to do this it must not only be free to do so, but also must be seen by the public to be independent.
- b) A council’s recommendation to the minister must be technically sound, regardless of how that soundness is substantiated.
- c) Councils must stay with priorities, as reflected in public opinion, ministerial requirements, and any technical parameters.
- d) Councils must be financially independent at a minimum satisfactory level.

Other Subject Areas

The following is a summary of Group 3's oral report to the plenary session on the other topics which it addressed.

The Group discussed topic B — "Role of Councils in Relation to the Public", and looked at "Role of Councils in Relation to the Department". Again, the group found a great variety of approaches actually taken by councils. The group agreed that public opinion is the only true basis or ally of a minister, making it important for councils to play a role with respect to the public.

The public was defined as consisting of three categories: (i) Experts; (ii) Groups; and (iii) Public-at-large (including local publics).

With respect to these publics, councils' role may include one or more of the following:

- 1) Advocacy role – in which councils attempt to bring about changes by stirring up public opinion.
- 2) Informing and educating the public.
- 3) Hearing the concerns of the public(s) and informing the minister accordingly.
- 4) Functioning as an environmental ombudsman.

The group questioned Dr. Brooks' thesis given in his luncheon address that a council could either serve as an advisor to the minister or deal with the public, but not both. The group concluded, with reference to the model, that the only role where there was an actual potential conflict of interest was the advocacy role. The group felt that the councils probably did not really have to perform an activist role with respect to the public because special interest groups handled that role adequately. As for informing and educating the public and listening to the public, and informing the minister accordingly, the group felt quite strongly that councils needed to fulfill those roles. Moreover, they could play an advocacy role if the minister asked them to do so.

In summary, the group concluded that for the sake of the environment, governments need such advisory organizations, preferably organizations that are not part of the bureaucracy, present a non-governmental view to the minister and are in touch with the public.

With respect to "Relationship of Councils with the Department", all participants in the group admitted that they were quite dependent on their respective departments. The group did not complete this aspect of the model, but thought that it would be useful to complete it and compare how the seven or eight councils in Canada are established and organized. Indeed, the model could help individual councils to examine their own performance. All councils are dependent on government departments for information on their programs and projects. Representatives of departments are asked to brief councils on situations and issues, so that environmental consequences can be determined, and on policy as it is being effected rather than on policy as it is being conceived.

ANNEX I

VIIIth Assembly of Councils
June 6-7, 1983

Brief Summaries on Environmental Advisory Councils

This type of summary was initially prepared for the first Assembly of Councils in 1975. This latest revision is based on information provided by individual councils and, for jurisdictions where no environmental advisory councils exist, by officials of environment departments.

Revised: May 1, 1983

Prepared by: Canadian Environmental
Advisory Council
Ottawa, Ontario

CANADA

TITLE: Canadian Environmental Advisory Council

MAILING ADDRESS: Department of Environment
22nd Floor, Les Terrasses de la Chaudière
10 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H3

TELEPHONE NO(s): (819) 997-2395 or 997-2397

CHAIRMAN: Mr. T. Beck Tele: (403) 277-1363

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Mr. M. McConnell

YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1972

Composition & by whom appointed:

Up to 16 members appointed by Minister of the Environment for up to 3 year terms, renewable, Chairman and Vice-chairman appointed by Minister

Major activities:

- Provide independent advice to the Minister on environmental issues.
- On request from the Department review and advise on Departmental programs and policies.
- Conduct studies on major environmental concerns.
- Approximately 12 meetings per year (6 full council, 6 executive)

Amount & source of annual funding:

Department of Environment provides an annual budget for Council of approximately \$200,000. plus some staff support.

Sub-Committees:

Ad Hoc Task Forces or Working Groups (e.g. Northern Environment, EARP)

Remuneration to members:

\$75 per diem plus expenses when on council business. Chairman and Vice-chairman \$200 per diem plus expenses

Publications:

11 Reports on specific subjects, and Biennial reports

PROVINCE: **BRITISH COLUMBIA**

TITLE: (No Environmental Advisory Council)

MAILING ADDRESS: Ministry of Environment
Legislative Buildings
Victoria, British Columbia

TELEPHONE NO(s): (604) 387-1161

Mr. B.E. Marr, Deputy Minister, Environment

YEAR ESTABLISHED:

Composition & by whom appointed:

Major activities:

Amount & source of annual funding:

Sub-Committees:

Remuneration to members:

Publications:

PROVINCE: ALBERTA

TITLE: Environment Council of Alberta

MAILING ADDRESS: 8th Floor, Weber Centre
5555 Calgary Trail
Edmonton, Alberta
T6H 5P9

TELEPHONE NO(s): (403) 427-5792

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Alistair D. Crerar

YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1970

Authority:

The Environment Council Act,
Chapter E-13, Revised Statutes of
Alberta 1980.

Major responsibilities:

1. To hold public hearings on major environmental matters and to report on the matters to the Lieutenant Governor in Council and the Minister of the Environment.
2. To conduct ongoing reviews of provincial environmental policies and programs and report on them to the Minister of the Environment.
3. To conduct inquiries on matters pertaining to environmental conservation at the request of the Minister of the Environment.
4. To hear appeals against Stop Orders issued under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Department of the Environment Act, the Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act, and the Beverage Container Act.
5. To hear representations under the Wilderness, Ecological Reserves and Natural Areas Acts.

Activities:

1. Preparation of reports and recommendations to government on public hearing topics.
2. Preparation of technical reports and summaries for public hearings and policy review matters.

3. Ongoing public forum on environmental issues through discussions at the Public Advisory Committee (six study groups, three committees) meetings.
4. Operation of a library accessible by the public and extensive free distribution of information.

Publications:

1. Reports and Recommendations from public hearings.
2. Annual Reports — ECA, Public Advisory Committee.
3. Technical and Summary Reports related to responsibilities — present publications list contains 140 items.
4. Special proceedings of conferences etc.

Funding and Composition:

1. Funded on an annual basis by contributions from the Government of Alberta.
2. Chief executive officer appointed by Order-in-Council.
3. 26 permanent salaried staff appointed pursuant to the Public Service Act.
4. Panel members (usually 3) appointed from time to time by Order-in-Council, paid on a per diem basis plus expenses.
5. Approximately 185 citizens of the province on the Public Advisory Committee, reimbursed for expenses.

PROVINCE: SASKATCHEWAN

TITLE: Saskatchewan Environmental Advisory Council

MAILING ADDRESS: Saskatchewan Environment
5th Floor, 1855 Victoria Avenue
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 3V5

TELEPHONE NO(s): (306) 565-6111

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Alan Carr, Deputy Minister, Environment

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:

YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1973

Composition & by whom appointed:

Chairman, Vice-chairman and ten other members appointed by the Minister of Environment.

- Ex. Ass't only full time staff.

Major activities:

- Review government policies and programs relating to environment and report findings and recommendations to the minister
- Bring to the minister's attention problem areas requiring government action
- Serve as focal point for public reaction to government programs

Amount & source of annual funding:

Total operating grant of \$57,450. (81-82)

Special Projects:
Allocation = \$7,300 plus expenses.

Sub-Committees:

Designation of sub-committees when appropriate.

Remuneration to members:

Chairman \$90 per day
members \$65 per day

Publications:

- Annual Report
- Acid Rain Report

PROVINCE: MANITOBA

TITLE: Manitoba Environmental Council

MAILING ADDRESS: Box 139
139 Tuxedo Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3N 0H6

TELEPHONE NO(s): (204) 895-5317

CHAIRMAN: Dr. A.C. Maniar

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Mr. J.J. Keleher

YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1972

<p>Composition & by whom appointed:</p> <p>Hon. Members: Minister of Environment, Deputy Minister, Assistant Deputy Minister</p> <p>Members: Representatives of organizations and private citizens, not to exceed 100. Ministerial appointment — 2 years, renewable</p>	<p>Major activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Submits briefs to Minister and other environmental jurisdictions - Hold public forums (proceedings are published) - Cartoon contest - 2 Council meetings per year
<p>Amount & source of annual funding:</p> <p>Dept. Appropriation</p> <p>1982/83: \$28,400 excluding staff salary</p> <p>Staff — 1, Exec. Secretary plus secretariat & financial assistance by Dept.</p>	<p>Committees:</p> <p>Board of Directors, Executive Committee, Standing Committees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional - Membership - Publications - Nominations <p>Special Committees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental Assessment - Land Use - Wildlife - Water & Waste - Education - Energy
<p>Remuneration to members:</p> <p>Govt. rates for incurred travel expenses to Members residing outside of Winnipeg</p>	<p>Publications:</p> <p>9 annual reports 15 studies (1973-82) 1 Topics (1982) 1 Information pamphlet</p>

PROVINCE:

ONTARIO

TITLE:

(No Environmental Advisory Council)

MAILING ADDRESS:

Ministry of Environment
135 St. Clair Avenue West
Toronto, Ontario
M4V 1P5

TELEPHONE NO(s):

(416) 965-5115

Mr. G.J.M. Raymond, Deputy Minister, Environment

Mr. W.B. Drowley, Senior Advisor to Minister

Composition & by whom appointed:

Major activities:

Amount & source of annual funding:

Sub-Committees:

Remuneration to members:

Publications:

PROVINCE: QUEBEC

TITLE: Conseil consultatif de l'Environnement

MAILING ADDRESS: 1020, rue St-Augustin
Quebec, Quebec
G1R 5J1

TELEPHONE NO(s): (418) 643-3818

CHAIRMAN: M. André Beauchamp

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Dr. Camille Rousseau

YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1972

<p>Composition & by whom appointed:</p> <p>Chairman plus 10 members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - chairman full time job - members part time (about 2 days per month). <p>Support Staff:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Secretary to Council 2. Scientific Advisors 3. Secretarial Staff. 	<p>Major activities:</p> <p>Studies and recommendations related to environmental policies, legislation and regulations. Possibility of public consultations on such matters by government organization established specifically for this purpose.</p>
<p>Amount & source of annual funding:</p> <p>Annual Budget about \$300,000</p>	<p>Sub-Committees:</p> <p>No permanent committees. Ad hoc working groups (3 to 4 members of council for major studies).</p>
<p>Remuneration to members:</p> <p>Per diem \$150 plus travel expenses</p>	<p>Publications:</p> <p>38 publications and reports to date on various subjects. List available from Québec Council on request.</p>

PROVINCE: NEW BRUNSWICK

TITLE: Environmental Council of New Brunswick

MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1

TELEPHONE NO(s): (713) 453-2861

CHAIRMAN: (Appointment pending)

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Mrs. Margaret Taylor

YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1972

Composition & by whom appointed:

12 members appointed by order in council under recommendation of Minister for three years or pleasure of Minister

Major activities:

Environmental Goals
Ecological Reserves
Advise the Minister on matters of .
Environmental concern

Amount & source of annual funding:

On project basis from Department of Environment

Sub-Committees:

- Land Use
- Ecological Reserves
- Public Participation
- Education
- Legal
- Chemical and Waste Management

Remuneration to members:

\$75 plus expenses, President
\$100/day

Publications:

Annual Reports 1972-1981

PROVINCE: NOVA SCOTIA

TITLE: Nova Scotia Environmental Control Council

MAILING ADDRESS: General Office
Centennial Building
1660 Hollis Street
P.O. Box 2107
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 3B7

TELEPHONE NO(s): (902) 667-7214

CHAIRMAN: Mr. James MacDonald Tel: (902) 564-5525

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Mr. Morris Haugg
P.O. Box 279
Amherst, Nova Scotia
B4H 3Z2 Tel: (902) 667-7214

RESEARCH COORDINATOR: Ms. Donna McCready Tel: (902) 424-5300

YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1973

Composition & by whom appointed:

12-15 members, 11 representing selected disciplines or groups (2 yr. term) plus D.M. Environment plus Executive Secretary plus Consultant. Council Members appointed by Governor in Council. Executive Secretary and Consultant appointed without term by Minister. One permanent part-time staff.

Amount & source of annual funding:

Budget \$100,000 ± annually, including \$15,000 for special projects and \$20,000 for public hearings.

Remuneration to members:

Honorarium \$1500/member
Executive Member \$7500 Chairman \$9000
Consultant \$8000 Executive Secretary \$10,200 plus all expenses paid.

Per diem paid to members who conduct public hearings.

Major activities:

- Advice to Minister on all questions of environmental importance
- review of departmental policy and activities
- holding of formal public hearings at request of Minister
- commissioning of special studies
- participation/leadership in public meetings and concern committees

Sub-Committees:

Executive Committee Ad Hoc as required.

Meetings: full Council meets minimum three times per year 1 1/2 days each.

Executive meets monthly or oftener.

Publications:

Annual Reports Special Studies

PROVINCE: **PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND**

TITLE: (No Environmental Advisory Council)

MAILING ADDRESS: Department of Community and Cultural Affairs
P.O. Box 2000
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
C1A 7N8

TELEPHONE NO(s): (902) 892-3561

Mr. Clyde Stewart, Deputy Minister, Environment

Mr. A. Lavoie

YEAR ESTABLISHED: 1972; disbanded 1982

Composition & by whom appointed:

Major activities:

Amount & source of annual funding:

Sub-Committees:

Remuneration to members:

Publications:

PROVINCE: NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

TITLE: (No Environmental Advisory Council)

MAILING ADDRESS: Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
St. John's, Newfoundland

TELEPHONE NO(s): (709) 737-2572

Mr. W.A. Kinsman, Deputy Minister, Environment

YEAR ESTABLISHED:

Composition & by whom appointed:	Major activities:
Amount & source of annual funding:	Sub-Committees:
Remuneration to members:	Publications:

PROVINCE: YUKON

TITLE: (No Environmental Advisory Council)

MAILING ADDRESS: Department of Renewable Resources
P.O. Box 2703
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2C6

TELEPHONE NO(s): (403) 667-5460

Mr. G. Livingston, Deputy Minister

YEAR ESTABLISHED:

Composition & by whom appointed:

Major activities:

Amount & source of annual funding:

Sub-Committees:

Remuneration to members:

Publications:

PROVINCE: **NORTHWEST TERRITORIES**

TITLE: (No Environmental Advisory Council)
Science Advisory Board

MAILING ADDRESS: Box 1617
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X0E 1H0

Chairman's address:
4 Kippewa Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 3G4

TELEPHONE NO(s): (403) 873-7592

CHAIRMAN: Dr. J. Harrison Tele: (613) 233-6906

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Mr. R.K. Bell Tele: (403) 873-7592

YEAR ESTABLISHED:

Composition & by whom appointed:

7 to 13 members appointed by the
Commissioner of the NWT.

Major activities:

- initiates specific scientific investigations requested by the Legislative Assembly
- recommends research programmes to the Legislative Assembly
- supports the involvement of NWT high school students in scientific programs

Amount & source of annual funding:

\$200,000 from the Government of the
NWT.

Sub-Committees:

None

Remuneration to members:

Honoraria

Members: \$100/day

Chairman: \$150/day

Publications:

- annual report
- contract report series
- reports to the Legislative Assembly

